

makes many unhealthy conditions possible in the post office and Government offices, and I believe the best way to meet the situation is to eliminate the provision and make the promotions automatic. After all, if an employee is not meeting acceptable standards of work, he can be separated as incompetent. If the supervisor takes this course, the employee can defend himself through the appeals procedure. As it now stands, however, the employee has no real means of defending himself from possible vindictiveness and injustice.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to H.R. 8995 to provide salary increases, I want to call the committee's attention to other bills before your committee, which I have introduced in behalf of Federal employees, and to urge your early consideration of them.

H.R. 1020, providing for 30-year retirement without reduction in annuity; H.R. 1023 for an improved system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees; H.R. 1021 to eliminate the use of work measuring devices in the postal service; H.R. 2612 to liberalize the annuities formula; and H.R. 1019 to provide an allowance for work clothing of certain postal field service employees. I have also introduced H.R. 1013, which is before the Ways and Means Committee, to exempt from income tax the annuities and pensions of Federal employees.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that, if we are to maintain a high level of efficiency in our Government service—if we are to retain loyal and dedicated workers and preserve employee morale in the Government—we have a definite responsibility to provide them with adequate pay and with fair and equitable work standards and promotion schedules.

We spend billions to close the missile gap, to lead the space race, and for foreign aid to improve the living standards of peoples around the globe. We must take action now to improve the living standards of our Federal employees.

FE  **Purcell**
VIETNAM POLICIES

(Mr. PURCELL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently we have been hearing more criticism of our policies in South Vietnam, particularly from some of our college campuses. Seldom, however, do we have an opportunity to get the views of those who are paying the heaviest price, the American fighting men who are helping South Vietnam defend itself.

I was privileged to receive a copy of a letter written to the editor of the Denton, Tex., Record Chronicle by a resident of Denton serving in South Vietnam, Lones E. Taylor, AMH3, U.S. Navy.

I particularly want to call attention to his pointed question:

We sacrifice everything dear to us, some even their lives. Is it too much for us to ask and expect that you at home have faith and back us just a little?

For us to fail to stand with this young man, those who serve with him, and the South Vietnamese, will only delay the time when we would be forced to call a halt to the expansionist policies of the Communists in Asia. If we are to contain them, and we must do this sometime or perish, then we must recognize that although South Vietnam might not be the most ideal place for the confronta-

tion, the time to make our determination clear to the Communists is now.

Americans like to win. This is our nature, and it is very difficult for us to live with a situation where we can foresee a long period of struggle ahead beset with so many problems. But, if we are to prevail in this conflict, we must realize these difficulties will be with us and we must recognize the need to continue to support our effort in South Vietnam.

I commend this letter to my colleagues:

A LETTER ON VIETNAM
JUNE 13, 1965.

DEAR EDITOR: Whether or not you print this letter is up to you and your paper, but I feel I must write what I and many men over here in the Vietnam war feel.

As for myself, there were many reasons I stayed in the Navy (of which money certainly wasn't one) love of my home, family, and most of all, my country. I've never thought of myself as being very patriotic, but the more I read of papers back home, it turns my stomach to think that people can think so little of this wonderful country that we live in.

Among other things, the Navy has helped me to grow into a man and accept my responsibilities as a citizen of America, for which our forefathers fought and died so graciously and willingly.

Has everyone forgotten the basis that this country was founded on? Or don't they teach that in our colleges and universities today?

I have always regretted that I didn't attend college first instead of going into service, but now I'm not too sure. I would hate to think that I had the outlook on life and would so willingly turn down responsibility as students over the country today are doing.

They are making a mockery of everything that true Americans believe in today. When they protest the war in Vietnam and policies of our Government leaders by picketing the White House, burning their draft cards and doing many other disgraceful and unpatriotic things, it only shows their lack of learning and understanding. They don't care what they protest, or even care whom or what it hurts.

YOUTH WILL GOVERN WORLD

I realize they are only a small percentage of our young students, but if left to grow, could be our entire country, for the youth of today will govern the world tomorrow.

Most of this is caused by fear. No one wants war or to die in a far land that has little meaning to their lives.

This is not so. We over here know what we're fighting for. It isn't like the Korean war. We know now that we must fight communism anywhere over the world where it threatens free people that are depressed, poverty stricken and that are being eaten alive by the Communist machine. Not only for these reason but for our wives, families, and even our forefathers that have died before us.

We are over here now trying to do our job as we know it, but it is hard to have faith and fight for what we know to be right when people at home have no faith and aren't backing us as they should. Sometimes we wonder if you even care about us or yourselves.

Every day some of our shipmates fail to return to the ship (USS Midway), but they go each day knowing if they die we will carry on to win over communism in the end.

ONE LONE COMFORT

We left our comfortable homes, our wives and families to spend lonely, endless days at sea, our only comfort the fact that someday we'll be able to return in peace, for a while anyway.

We sacrifice everything dear to us, some even their lives. Is it too much for us to ask and expect that you at home have faith and back us just a little?

We are the ones fighting now and we're not complaining about it. Are people so afraid that they might be asked to fight a little for what (if anything) they believe in?

There isn't any one of us here who wouldn't like to change places with any student back home, but we believe in freedom. Doesn't anyone else believe in freedom any more?

Everyone wants peace, but to me it matters a great deal the price I have to pay for it. How can we expect to have peace and freedom at the expense of countries like South Vietnam if we turn our backs on them?

NO LONGER ANGRY

When I started this letter I was angry, but now I have compassion for those who believe that peace is good no matter what they have to do or what rights they have to give up to get it.

If we follow this line of thinking we'll soon have nothing else to lose and will be lost and buried by communism, because there will be nothing else to hope, believe, or fight for.

Has our morality dropped so low?

I've lived all my life in Denton prior to joining the Navy and I love the town and people. When this is over (the war), I plan to take my discharge with 6½ years' active service and return to my wife and children to take my place in a community that I'll be proud of.

I have heard of no such demonstrations from the campuses of Denton and this makes me proud and very happy.

If this letter serves no other purpose, I hope it will make a few people realize what I have tried to say and just understand a little of what is facing us.

We'll do the job. You just give us some support and we'll all be fulfilling our job. Give us back our faith in the American people again.

Respectfully submitted.

LONES E. TAYLOR, AMH3.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART CVI

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 3, 1965, concerning the Women's House of Detention in New York City.

The article is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis," and follows: NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PRISON REPORT ATTACKED

(By Alfonso Narvaez)

New York City's Women's House of Detention found itself enmeshed in another controversy yesterday as Democratic members of the State and city government attacked Deputy Mayor Edward Cavanagh's recent report that charges of "snake-pit" conditions at the prison "were without substance." They called for continued investigation into conditions at the penal institution.

Assemblyman Joseph Kottler, chairman of the assembly committee on penal institutions, charged that Mr. Cavanagh's report, made public last Tuesday, was "totally inadequate and one sided." He said that despite the fact that overcrowding at the prison had been alleviated, "it is still a snake-pit."

Mr. Kottler, interviewed on WCBS-TV's "Newsmakers," said that he had the recorded

testimony of four other former inmates of the prison who corroborated charges of rampant lesbianism, rats, vermin, poor food, and humiliating internal examinations.

Mr. Kottler brought with him to the studio three women who had been arrested during a civil rights demonstration last October and who had been held in the House of Detention for 5 days.

After the telecast, the women charged that they had been subjected to inadequate medical attention and humiliating examinations and that they had seen Lesbian activity, rats, and other vermin.

TAKEN AWAY

Helena Lewis, 28, of 20 West 10th Street, said that they had been searched practically in public for narcotics. She said that everything had been taken away from them, including medicine that had been prescribed for her by her doctor.

One of the other women, a psychologist at a residence for neglected girls, said that one of the guards patted some of the prisoners as they waited for their examination.

Mr. Kottler said that he was hopeful that two State investigations would begin soon to look into conditions at the prison and others throughout the State. He said that he had sponsored legislation calling for the creation of a joint legislative investigation committee and that Speaker of the House Anthony J. Travia favored the proposal.

In a radio interview on "The WINS News Conference," city Councilman Paul O'Dwyer sharply criticized Mr. Cavanagh for his "political" report refuting charges against the prison.

"I would say that he was a less than impartial reporter in connection with that situation," Mr. O'Dwyer said. "Several of us intend to make an investigation or an inquiry of our own there in the coming week."

Mr. O'Dwyer said that the report by Mr. Cavanagh had been made to offset a damaging report by Herman T. Stichman, Governor Rockefeller's special investigator, and to "come in to sort of put up a defense."

DISCOUNT REPORTS

Mr. O'Dwyer said that he would discount both reports and rely on statements by Corrections Commissioner Anna Kross, who "for the last 12 years has been screaming that conditions are bad in the Women's House of Detention."

During the last 2 months more than eight women have complained publicly about their treatment at the prison and have testified before various investigating committees of the conditions there.

If the 3 proposed investigations take place, they will bring to 10 the number of committees that have probed into charges of overcrowding and homosexual activity first made public by an 18-year-old Bennington College freshman, Andrea Dworkin, who had been arrested during a pacifist demonstration and who could not raise \$500 bail. She has recently been subpoenaed to appear before a May grand jury investigating conditions and treatment at the 33-year-old prison, at Greenwich Avenue and West 10th Street.

The prison has been the target of countless investigations ever since it first opened "as the greatest step forward in prison history." The prison, originally designed to house 401 inmates, held as many as 650 when charges of "snakepit" conditions were aired last month.

As a result of Deputy Mayor Cavanagh's preliminary investigations more than 100 women were transferred to the top floor of the Brooklyn House of Detention, which usually houses only men.

At last reports, there were 450 inmates housed in accommodations for 457.

Reports of shocking conditions at the prison and the mixing of young first offenders and other persons not yet convicted

of crimes with hardened female prisoners tend to highlight another apparent failure in the administration of New York City.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS— PART CVII

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns the role that businessmen should play in solving some of New York City's problems.

The article is part of the series on New York City in Crisis and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on May 4, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—DAVID ROCKEFELLER'S CALL FOR URBAN ACTION

(By Barrett McGurn)

David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, said yesterday that "private business" is the key to solving the crises threatening major cities from one side of America to the other.

Federal, State, and municipal funds combined will never amount to more than "seed money" in the face of the towering and multiplying needs of this country's great urban centers, the 49-year-old financier-philanthropist said.

For every dollar put up by Government, private business will have to raise five in order to assemble the immense sums needed, Mr. Rockefeller calculated.

Mr. Rockefeller made it clear that his analysis applied specifically to crisis ridden New York, the largest of the world's urban concentrations.

He spoke in Miami Beach to the 33d annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute. He talked of America's great cities and mentioned that success in this country in meeting the challenge would be a model for the whole planet. Mr. Rockefeller pointed out that the growth of city difficulties has been compared by the United Nations World Health Organization with war and peace as a foremost issue of the remaining 20th century years. He frequently cited the woes and efforts of New York in arguing his major thesis:

Business should shoulder its large share of the burden, but more favorable tax structures are needed as an inducement.

"The major investment must be underwritten by private sources.

"And to attract such substantial funds, we must take steps to make investment in urban redevelopment more appealing in competition with other opportunities.

"Modifications in some existing tax regulations, and the use of vehicles that would be free from some tax restraints, offer possible avenues of approach.

"Properly conceived, taxes can be made to stimulate growth as well as produce revenue."

LEADERSHIP

Mr. Rockefeller's comments were the latest contribution to a great public forum on the crisis of such areas as New York City, a colloquy which has mounted in intensity since the start of the continuing Herald Tribune series on "New York City in Crisis."

Like two other episodes, the formation of a Committee of 14 to cope especially with the New York blue collar job drain, and the creation of the Committee of 65 to combat the commuter rail crisis, Mr. Rockefeller's contribution was based on the prime assumption that business leadership must be part of any solution to the city's ills.

Mr. Rockefeller is a member of the Committee of 65. His Chase Manhattan board chairman, George Champion, is a key figure in the Committee of 14, and is immediate past president of the 197-year-old New York Chamber of Commerce, which sounded the first call for business leadership in tackling the difficulties of a city in crisis.

Mr. Rockefeller's comments were considered particularly significant because of his prominent position in New York civic and financial circles. He has often been suggested as a Republican candidate for mayor or as the leader of a businessmen's drive to combat New York's difficulties, but always has refused to join his brother, the Governor, in anything smacking of politics. Mr. Rockefeller is, however, president of the Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, which has led the way in New York local reform by injecting hundreds of millions of dollars of new life into the once-fading Wall Street financial area.

Mr. Rockefeller made these remarks on the importance of the problem of the increasing urbanization of America:

"The United Nations World Health Organization declared recently that 'after the question of keeping world peace, metropolitan planning is probably the most serious single problem faced by man in the second half of the 20th century.' Indeed, it is a problem of such enormous magnitude, baffling complexity and immense diversity that it compels our attention and our energies.

"We are coming to realize the immense dangers of an uncontained population explosion and all this portends for inhibiting material progress. Now we must also acknowledge the dangers inherent in an uncontrolled population implosion, the tremendous influx of people into huge urban centers and the self-generating congestion of our cities."

STIMULATING NEWS

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we are all delighted with the President's act in signing the excise tax reduction bill on Monday. The following editorial from the New York Journal American of June 21, 1965, comments upon that and several other pieces of good news:

STIMULATING NEWS

President Johnson signs today the bill providing for \$4.6 billion in reductions on excise taxes on a wide variety of consumer goods. It should be a vitamin shot to the economy.

The President estimates the bill will release about \$1.75 billion in extra purchasing power during the remainder of this year, and another \$1.75 billion next January when further excise cuts of \$1.6 billion are scheduled.

Together with this development is the stimulating announcement by the President that the Federal budget deficit for the year ending June 30 will be about \$3.8 billion—\$2.5 billion less than his estimate last January.

For the most part the lower budget deficit is attributed to last year's cut in corporate and personal income taxes. Economists hold it has stepped up demand for goods and services, thereby increasing corporate and personal incomes and raising Federal revenues.

Other aspects of good news are:

The administration's program to cut the dollar drain of Government programs abroad has reduced the net balance-of-payment costs by 23 percent, or \$635 million.

June 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3315

No National Outcry Against Chicago Demonstrations**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include an article by Paul Harvey which appeared in the Gadsden, Ala., Times on June 20. Mr. Harvey's discussion of the lawlessness in Chicago as contrasted to that in Selma, Ala., shows clearly the double standard exercised by much of the news media and others in their continuing attacks upon the South.

[From the Gadsden Times, June 20, 1965] FERMENT, BITTERNESS, AND THE THREAT OF BLOODSHED TAUNTS LIFE OF CHICAGO

(By Paul Harvey)

This is Chicago. The long, hot summer has begun. In the concrete canyons of the Loop and in the steamy asphalt jungles which surround it, there is ferment, bitterness, and the threat of bloodshed.

Three weeks ago in Chicago, Harlem Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL urged Negroes to seek for themselves "audacious power."

Coincidence or not, since that speech the tempo of marching, picketing, demonstrating has increased in Chicago.

During the 2-day visit of the astronauts, the entire city held its breath over the brazen boast by a rabble-rousing "rights" leader who threatened to "do something that will upset the whole country." He didn't.

Overwhelmed by official pleading, public indignation, and newspaper warnings "not to go too far," the demonstrators kept their peace for 24 hours.

The next day the midcity marching began again, protesting "de facto school segregation," demanding the ouster of School Superintendent Willis.

Every day now it's something else. A local demonstration leader says the "real target is Mayor Daley."

"If we can topple the Daley machine in Chicago, we can topple the machine of any northern city. If we can't do it with marches we will take economic means."

Comic-crusader Dick Gregory urged followers to turn on all water faucets and thus cripple the city's water supply.

He and 440 others including James Farmer, were arrested earlier this month, detained, then released.

As these were handcuffed and tossed into police vans, the Chicago press gave this local story less picture coverage than it customarily gives to similar incidents in the South.

Selma, Ala.'s mayor wondered why. He sent a telegram to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS asking why Mrs. Douglas did not participate in the demonstrations in Chicago. She had gone all the way to Selma, Ala., to march, said Mayor Joe Smitherman.

"Coming to Selma, Ala., was in our national interest, certainly you could do as much good in taking the same action in your own State."

LeRoy Collins, President Johnson's trouble-shooter in race relations, in Chicago last week, urged northerners to "view their own ghettos instead of concentrating on southern racial problems." He termed Chicago's South Side Negro neighborhoods "sickening," "a disgrace."

He said, "the urban ghetto of Chicago, and everywhere it exists, feeds on its own filth—then spreads its poison, physical and moral, through the whole body of our population."

It was such a little while ago that Chicago's press and public officials—and some clergy—were so generous with their carte blanche castigation and condemnation of the South.

I knew and said then that there would be a day of reckoning for such hypocrisy. No, I find no satisfaction in the realization of that prediction. Only sadness—to see the storm clouds gather.

Alibates Flint Quarries Reveal Early American History**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, now pending before the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is a bill, which I have introduced, to establish the Alibates Flint Quarry, on the Canadian River, as a national monument.

Discovered in 1925, this 300-foot-wide, mile-long shard of a ridge, about 35 miles northeast of the present city of Amarillo, is one of the most significant archeological finds of our time. Alibates flint was the best material for making weapons and tools that the early American man could find; and this particular quarry is the only place where it could be obtained.

Two ancient Pueblo-type villages and numerous campsites have already been discovered, and indicate that a community developed around the quarry. Further archeological explorations will surely uncover many more significant relics of these early years of our continent's history.

In order that further explorations may be promoted and, in order that this important monument of early America may be secured for the intellectual enrichment and pleasure of all the people of Texas and of our Nation, both present and future, I feel that it is the responsibility of this Congress to preserve the Alibates flint quarry as a national monument.

Recently, an article entitled "Alibates Flint Quarry Pinpoint 'Longest Story'" was published in the Amarillo Sunday News-Globe of May 16, 1965. The article was written by Thomas Hough. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) News-Globe, May 16, 1965]

ALIBATES FLINT QUARRIES PINPOINT LONGEST STORY

(By Thomas Hough)

AMARILLO.—Walking over the Alibates flint quarries in the Texas Panhandle makes a person realize that the Pyramids and China's

famous stone wall are recent innovations in man's life upon earth.

The quarry contains the longest story ever told.

When naked early man killed the giant mammoth for food, he used the best weapons he could get: That is why Alibates flint holds such a prominent place in archeology.

Because of a 35-year secret by a dedicated amateur archeologist, and the administrative skills of an Amarillo businessman, the priceless story in the quarries now will be preserved for all mankind.

The businessman is Henry Hertner, a former city commissioner, who took the lead in bringing the project to the attention of Government officials so that the site could be protected as a monument to prehistoric free enterprise.

Back in 1925, Floyd Studer, of Amarillo, discovered the quarries on one of his many field trips. Studer probably has done more poking around in the Panhandle than any other single person.

Many of his artifacts from a lifetime of collecting are displayed in the Panhandle Plains Historical Museum at Canyon.

Studer knew he had a great discovery, but he had no way of exploring it. So he kept it a secret.

He did share his discoveries with a few prominent archeologists. They determined that flint from the Alibates quarries had been taken into Canada, to California—in fact, all over the West.

Alibates flint made the best weapons and tools that early American man could find. And there was only one place in the world where it could be obtained—out of the 300-foot-wide, mile-long shard of a ridge about 35 miles northeast of the present city of Amarillo.

Archeologists say the flint must have had extreme value in order for early man to have carried it so far away from the quarries.

Today a person can see the hundreds, at last count, 550 pits that pock the area. Ancient man used poles, stones, and his hands to root through the weathered surface rock to get solid flint.

Two ancient Pueblo-type villages and numerous campsites in the area indicate that at one time flourishing communities existed.

Competent exploration of ancient civilization takes time and money. Progress is slow. Studer continued to keep secret the location of the quarries.

But then the Canadian River Water Authority began planning Sanford Dam to contain Lake Meredith. The water will be used by 11 west Texas cities, and the lake is planned as a recreation area for water sports enthusiasts.

VFW Citation to the Defenders of Quemoy**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as Members of this House are well aware, is one of our most helpful and influential national organizations.

One of the reasons the VFW's views are respected and listened to is that the VFW officials know what they are talking about. For example, in matters pertaining to national security and international policies, the VFW speaks with per-

A3316

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 24, 1965

sonal knowledge. The VFW national commander and the organization's national security director have seen personally the troubled spots that are of such deep concern to our Nation.

Within the past few weeks National VFW Commander John A. Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala., who is well known to Members of this House, and the VFW National Security and Foreign Affairs Director, Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps (retired), personally visited southeast Asia, including battle fronts in South Vietnam. In so doing, the VFW commander performed a truly valuable service to our country and its fighting men. As representative of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans, Buck Jenkins could personally assure our fighting men—and he did—that our country is behind them and they are not forgotten in the far away battlefields.

There was another great service performed by the VFW through Commander Jenkins. During his visit to the Republic of China, he flew in a Republic of China Air Force plane to the off-shore, and regularly shelled, island of Quemoy. This island of Quemoy is an outpost of freedom in Asia and is a bastion of the free world's defense against aggressive communism in the western Pacific.

On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and as a result of a resolution unanimously adopted by the VFW at its 1964 national convention, in Cleveland, Ohio, Commander Jenkins presented a VFW certificate of admiration and appreciation to the military and civilian defenders of Quemoy for their contribution to the defense of the free world. It is such things as this which the VFW does to strengthen our defense against communism, that has earned the VFW such high esteem in the United States and overseas.

Commander Jenkins' remarks were brief but eloquent, and because of the importance of the occasion, as well as what the VFW commander said, I include his presentation address at the conclusion of these remarks:

REMARKS OF JOHN A. JENKINS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESENTATION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS CITATION TO THE MILITARY AND CIVILIAN DEFENDERS OF QUEMOY, QUEMOY, REPUBLIC OF CHINA, MAY 12, 1965

One of the high privileges that comes to me as the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, is to present on behalf of the VFW, citations honoring those who have contributed to the defense of the free world. Today, it is my privilege and pleasure to participate in such a presentation.

I bring you the greetings and respects of the 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans who comprise the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Every member of the VFW is a combat veteran. Because of this experience, our members respect and admire those who have demonstrated heroic bravery in the face of enemy attack.

We of the VFW share with freedom-loving peoples everywhere a devotion to liberty and a determination to defend freedom against the evil attacks of communism. We know that the free world can be protected only by people who believe so deeply in freedom that they will die to preserve it.

Because we recognize these things, we recognize the importance of Quemoy and the heroism of those who have defended it so bravely and effectively.

Consequently, the thousands of delegates attending the 1964 convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States in Cleveland, Ohio, last August, unanimously voted to award an official citation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to the military and civilian defenders of Quemoy.

This decision by the convention was made for many reasons:

Because of the bravery and the determination you have demonstrated in beating back repeatedly the onslaughts of Communist aggression.

Because of the brave manner in which you defy communism while living on an island of freedom literally under the guns of communism.

Because in defending Quemoy against Communist aggression you are preventing communism from seizing Quemoy, which is one of the most strategically important positions in the defense of the free world.

And finally, we of the VFW take this means of expressing to the military and civilian defenders of Quemoy our admiration and our gratitude for all these things which you have done in the defense of your freedom, and most assuredly in the defense of free peoples everywhere.

At this time it is my privilege, as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, to present this official citation. It is our hope that it will be for you a lasting reminder of the friendship, admiration, and esteem in which you are held by the members of our organization.

It is our hope, too, that although we may be separated from you by the thousands of miles of the Pacific Ocean, you are not forgotten, and that what you have done, and what you are doing in the defense of freedom, is prominently in our thoughts and our hearts.

FE

Debate on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as President Johnson recently said on nationwide television, the genius and strength of America rest largely with our freedom to debate and criticize our national policies.

Certainly, no thinking American wants to curb that freedom of discussion. By the same token, however, no American wants this precious liberty to damage the many other freedoms for which the United States stands.

Unfortunately, I feel that the loud and, in far too many cases, uninformed criticisms of America's commitment in Vietnam have, indeed, damaged the cause of world freedom.

Max Freedman, in an article entitled "The Progression in Vietnam Debate," which was published in the June 23 issue of the Washington Star, made this point quite clear.

Mr. Freedman noted that President Johnson has made every effort within reason to find a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

The President has tried to meet every legitimate request. First, there was the demand for negotiations. The President eloquently appealed for negotiations, with his offer of unconditional discussions. The Communists turned a deaf ear.

Next came the demand to halt the bombing. The President ordered this pause. Again, the Communists refused to help find a way to peace.

Now there is the demand for negotiations with the Vietcong.

Criticism is essential to our democracy. But, in this case, such criticism seems to be strengthening the Communists' determination to control all of southeast Asia.

Mr. Freedman pointed out this danger:

Over the weekend President Ho Chi Minh, of North Vietnam, was quoted as saying that the Communist military effort is receiving encouragement from the criticisms heard inside the United States.

I strongly support President Johnson's leadership of the free world.

Communism knows one language; that is the language of strength and determination. The United States has the strength. President Johnson has displayed the determination.

I recommend that the entire Freedman article be read. At this time I request consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE PROGRESSION IN VIETNAM DEBATE
(By Max Freedman)

In the White House they are drawing up an interesting list of the various stages that have marked the public debate on Vietnam.

First there was the demand for negotiations. This demand died away when the President went to Baltimore and made his offer of unconditional discussions.

Then there was the campaign for a pause in the bombing. When President Johnson ordered this pause and nothing happened to bring the Communists to the conference table, the agitation became far less vehement.

Now there is a demand for direct negotiations with the Vietcong. The White House is struck by the progression of these demands. The argument moves from a simple request for negotiations, to a campaign against bombing raids on North Vietnam, to a demand for a negotiated settlement based on direct talks with the Communist guerrilla forces in South Vietnam. Always the pressure is on the United States to make the first concessions to the Communists.

In pointing to these facts, White House officials make no criticism of the group of Democratic Senators who have become the public opponents of U.S. policies in Vietnam. The President himself has acknowledged that these Senators have both "the right and the duty" to express their convictions on such a major aspect of U.S. policy. Officials in the White House are not opposed to criticism. They are wondering instead whether the critics are sufficiently aware of the uses to which their protests have been put by the Communist side.

Instead of persuading the Communists that the time had come to seek a negotiated settlement, these American criticisms have had the opposite effect. They have hardened the Communist military campaign, led them to hope that the United States may yet become grievously divided, and pushed the

June 24, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3317

Communists further away from the conference room.

Over the weekend President Ho Chi Minh, of North Vietnam, was quoted in Pravda as saying that the Communist military effort is receiving encouragement from the criticisms heard inside the United States.

Now the last thought in the mind of any Senator is to say or do anything that will bring aid and comfort to the Communists. Not a single critical Senator is trying to help the Communist side. Without exception all of them are trying to save the United States from following a path that they conceive to be full of mischief and danger. Their convictions command respect even when they do not carry agreement; for it is never easy to stand out against a mounting war fever.

But it cannot be challenged by anyone who has studied the uses made in Hanoi and Peiping of these senatorial criticisms that they have an impact which quite often mocks the purposes of the speakers. These Senators are men of experience and patriotism. It surely should be possible for them, within the traditions of responsible debate, to criticize their own Government without giving comfort and encouragement to the Communists. After all, they could have been no happier than the White House with Ho Chi Minh's interview with Pravda.

Incidentally, far too much has been made of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's meeting with the President before his recent speech in the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Arkansas Democrat has his own constitutional duties to discharge. His ability to command a national or indeed a world audience does not depend on his being a spokesman for the White House. It depends on his own intrinsic wisdom. Nobody understands this better than the President.

That being clearly understood, it should be added that it is utter nonsense for the Republican Party to pretend that FULBRIGHT is challenging the President's program. Johnson is pledged to a policy of unconditional discussions. That means he is ready to go to the conference table without preconditions of any kind. He is ready to listen to everything without agreeing to anything in advance.

Quite plainly there can be no settlement, as FULBRIGHT has said, without concessions from both sides. The President has no quarrel at all with that position. He merely reserves the right to decide for himself at the proper time what precise concessions are in fact essential to a settlement. He would like that fact to be thoroughly understood here no less than by the Communists.

Kentucky Boosters Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, the Loyal Boosters Club of Bellevue, Ky., located in the Fourth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent here has passed a resolution calling for every one of its approximately 70 members to fly our American flag every day during the month of July.

This club which is one of the oldest in northern Kentucky, felt that instead of celebrating one day of Independence of our country, it would like to observe

this significant national holiday by displaying this beautiful banner for 31 days.

The club has the enthusiastic endorsement and cooperation of the city officials who have issued a proclamation designating July as "Rally Around the Flag" month. Other organizations are cooperating with the members of the club in devising ways and means of rendering special courtesies and respect to our national flag which stands for the United States of America, "one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Such special recognition by the Loyal Boosters Club is a splendid way of paying homage to this shining symbol of our national sovereignty, our glorious past, and the promise of our future greatness.

I would like to commend the Loyal Boosters Club for this admirable tribute. Each member of its organization and all of the others cooperating in this splendid action have given us a patriotic example worthy of praise and emulation.

The Real Alabama—Part XVII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, industrial expansion in Mobile and other parts of southern Alabama is continuing at a rapid pace. Leaders of industry have on many occasions indicated their successful experience with growth operations in our area.

As examples I call attention to the two following statements:

LOUISVILLE & NASHVILLE RAILROAD,
Louisville, Ky.

The Louisville & Nashville Railroad is proud of its past association with the development of the city of Mobile and is confident of future progress in which we expect to participate.

The location of Mobile provides a fortunate environment and a sunny industrial climate for the import and export of many commodities. As Alabama's only port, Mobile offers a growing operation that already ranks among the top 10 ports of the Nation. This status has been achieved largely through efforts of the Alabama State docks organization, which has provided facilities for convenient and economical transfer of goods from ship lines through an extensive rail distribution system to all parts of the United States.

The L. & N. contributed to the establishment of the State docks by deeding a substantial block of its property to the State early in 1926.

This railroad has also cooperated with the Alabama Development Association, the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce and civic leaders in promoting development for industrial use of 7,400 acres near Mobile.

Establishment of competitive freight rates has further encouraged industrial expansion at Mobile. Tangible results of these efforts include a recent expansion of International Paper Co.'s Mobile operation and the establishment by the Scott Paper Co., in cooperation with the L. & N., of a warehouse

to accommodate a large expansion of Scott's paper-producing mill.

WILLIAM H. KENDALL,
President.

INTERNATIONAL PAPER CO.,
New York.

International Paper Co. has been an industrial citizen of the Mobile area since 1928 and the headquarters of our Southern Kraft Division has been located there since 1930.

We have very deep roots in this enterprising, fast-moving community. Mobile has been home to several thousand of our employees and to many of us from other parts of the company. Mobile also has been a gracious host on the frequent occasions when we have visited there.

But much more important to our company has been the economic and business climate that has been fostered in Mobile by the public spirited businessmen and community leaders who set the tone for the city. Mobile welcomes growth; it welcomes innovation and expansion; it looks to the future.

To a large extent, this sound, business-oriented background has encouraged us to invest more than \$67 million in expansion and development of our Mobile operations since 1954. One of the most important single aspects of our operations in Mobile has been the establishment and growth of our Erling Rils Research Laboratory. Named for the former head of our southern operations and a longtime Mobile resident, this laboratory is one of the outstanding pulp and paper research organizations in the country.

We look forward to our future associations with your progressive, alert community. The combination of a growing complex of modern industry and a stable, hard-working, cordial populace, makes Mobile almost unique of all the cities in the Gulf South region.

RICHARD C. DOAN,
Chairman of the Board.

Employment of Older Workers in the
U.S. Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 24, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been interested in the extent to which the older people of our Nation have opportunities to be employed by the Federal Government. I have feared that it is entirely too difficult for an older person to get work with the Federal Government. I desire to include in the Record a letter which was written to me June 8, 1965, by Chairman John W. Macy. Chairman Macy has sent to me some very informative figures. I ask to include these figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1965.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Service,
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This letter is in reply to your inquiry of April 16, 1965, asking for information that might serve to update your subcommittee on developments in

A3318

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 24, 1965

the program to insure there is no discrimination against older persons in connection with Federal employment.

There has been no indication of need for a special drive in this area of placement of people and none has been undertaken. The reports received in our Bureau of Inspections have not shown any cause for concern. So far as we have any reason to believe the selection of older people from our registers is in reasonable relationship to the number who apply and are qualified. The Commission, however, is staying alert to any changes. We have in process a study of the Federal employee population by age which should shed further light on the overall situation. We expect to have the report by early summer and will send you a copy as soon as it is available.

One enclosure is the statistical material we prepared last year and submitted to the editors of the 1964 annual report of the President's Council on Aging which was issued under the title "Action for Older Americans." The material which we submitted was more comprehensive than the editors found occasion to use. It may be of interest to you.

Last year the Commission sponsored a bill to require mandatory retirement at age 70 after 5 years of service rather than after 15. Employment beyond 70 could still continue but on a year-to-year basis. We felt that such a measure would encourage agencies to appoint more people of really advanced years so far as normal employment prospects are concerned. The bill was reintroduced this year as H.R. 442. A copy of our report on it is enclosed.

Another enclosure of possible interest to you in connection with age and employment is a reprint of an early retirement survey from our Civil Service Journal, "Thirty-eight Years Is a Plenty."

Finally, it is my understanding that some of the agencies in the excepted service have elected to follow the same "no age limit" employment policy now required of all in the competitive service. The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is one of these.

I hope that this survey of developments will prove helpful to your subcommittee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MACY, Jr.,

Chairman.

Enclosures.

Federal employees covered by retirement system, by sex, age, and length of service, June 30, 1963

(Estimates based on a 10-percent sample of employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act)

Age and length of service	Total	Number of employees			Percent distribution ¹		
		Male	Female	Percent male	Total	Male	Female
Total	2,300,000	1,739,480	560,520	75.6	100.00	100.0	100.0
By age group: ²							
Under 20 years	14,080	3,410	10,670	24.2	.6	.2	1.9
20 to 24 years	107,630	51,700	55,930	48.0	4.7	3.0	10.0
25 to 29 years	171,280	123,790	47,490	72.3	7.4	7.1	8.5
30 to 34 years	224,900	188,750	46,150	80.4	10.2	10.9	8.2
35 to 39 years	318,500	260,960	67,540	78.8	13.8	14.4	12.1
40 to 44 years	418,070	332,950	85,120	79.6	18.2	19.1	15.2
45 to 49 years	371,630	293,950	77,680	79.0	16.2	16.9	13.9
50 to 54 years	285,050	217,170	67,880	76.2	12.4	12.5	12.1
55 to 59 years	201,300	147,630	53,670	73.3	8.8	8.5	9.6
60 to 64 years	114,830	81,710	33,120	71.2	5.0	4.7	5.9
65 to 69 years	66,070	42,460	23,610	75.7	2.4	2.4	2.4
70 to 74 years	5,980	4,890	1,290	78.4	.3	.3	.2
75 years and over	380	310	70	81.6	(³)	(³)	(³)
By length of service group: ⁴							
Under 5 years	313,040	166,960	146,080	53.3	13.6	9.0	26.1
5 to 9 years	440,600	324,490	116,010	73.7	19.2	18.7	20.7
10 to 14 years	435,820	326,000	109,820	74.9	18.9	18.7	19.5
15 to 19 years	458,390	367,200	91,190	81.0	19.7	21.1	15.4
20 to 24 years	457,660	379,690	77,970	83.0	19.9	21.8	13.9
25 to 29 years	122,840	105,490	17,350	85.9	5.3	6.1	3.1
30 to 34 years	41,250	36,890	4,360	88.5	1.8	2.1	.6
35 to 39 years	24,240	22,340	1,900	92.2	1.1	1.3	.3
40 to 44 years	9,650	8,910	740	92.3	.4	.5	.3
45 to 49 years	2,190	1,800	390	85.7	.1	.1	.1
50 years and over	110	110		100.0	(³)	(³)	

¹ Percents are rounded independently and not forced to add to totals.

² Average age for all employees, 43.1 years; for males, 43.5 years; for females, 42 years.

³ Less than 0.05 percent.

⁴ Average length of service for all employees, 14.2 years; for males, 15.1 years; and for females, 11.2 years.

TABLE 1.—Distribution of paid Federal civilian employment, by selected agency and by age group, June 30, 1962

Selected agency	Age group							
	Total	Less than 20	20 to 29	30 to 39	40 to 49	50 to 59	60 to 69	70 and over
General Accounting Office	4,768	75	818	960	1,227	1,249	409	
Department of State	5,002	148	887	1,091	1,569	939	318	
Department of the Treasury	82,997	1,784	11,078	18,194	25,244	18,396	8,205	96
Department of Defense	996,030	15,726	121,455	289,348	340,315	191,561	65,912	1,713
Office of the Secretary of Defense and other Defense activities	21,457	835	3,580	5,099	6,756	3,897	1,252	38
Department of the Army	356,338	6,914	44,391	92,589	118,794	69,567	23,468	615
Department of the Navy	331,480	4,591	35,108	77,435	118,710	69,625	25,421	590
Department of the Air Force	284,755	3,396	38,376	84,225	96,055	48,472	15,771	470
Department of Justice	17,971	464	2,130	4,155	5,901	3,957	1,327	47
Post Office Department	588,469	5,567	78,018	159,996	195,208	106,810	41,546	1,234
Department of the Interior	58,900	1,067	9,449	13,850	15,106	10,726	3,512	190
Department of Agriculture	110,945	2,576	19,390	27,580	29,850	23,435	7,041	174
Department of Commerce	31,124	732	6,891	7,561	8,257	6,122	2,025	36
Department of Labor	8,929	535	1,680	1,777	2,665	1,743	638	11
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	73,161	3,238	10,999	17,640	20,160	12,298	2,961	105
Civil Service Commission	4,123	168	514	972	1,463	704	291	11
General Services Administration	31,518	305	2,351	5,587	9,828	8,260	4,789	98
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,469	519	1,546	2,235	3,652	3,362	2,055	100
Information Agency	4,271	234	883	975	1,073	877	429	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,442	74	222	518	827	530	271	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	23,686	671	5,670	7,972	6,711	2,060	556	46
Veterans' Administration	176,224	1,445	22,301	44,575	56,235	34,828	13,540	310

NOTE.—These data have been drawn from a random sample of approximately 10 percent of the Federal work force and are therefore subject to sampling error. Excludes foreign nationals overseas, the Agency for International Development and the Peace Corps in the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice, the Alaska Railroad and the Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in the Department of Commerce, and the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

bases is so large, that the removal of this market, through conversion of burners on these bases to natural gas, would clearly make it uneconomic for the mines to continue to operate.

Officials of the Department of Defense had carefully and single mindedly studied this conversion proposal. In fact, it is precisely because the consideration was so single minded that greater and more important considerations than the estimated \$1 million a year saving, which would, ostensibly, be realized from conversion by the Federal Government, have been completely overlooked or have been given too little consideration.

Even if the presumed saving could have been realized—and I have serious doubts about that, the mischief which would be done by conversion would far outweigh, in the national interest, any economy which might result. There comes a time, I believe, when we should, in effect, stand back and ask ourselves just what it is that we are attempting to defend by means of our defense efforts. If it is not a sound economy, with successful operating industries, gainfully employed workers, with the families of these breadwinners living in security, and the generation of all the beneficial side effects for the economy which such activities produce, what is it we seek to defend?

Without its coal mines, the Matanuska Valley would have become an economically blighted area—a little Appalachia in the heart of the 49th State, where, not decay and retrogression, but growth and hope should be, and have in general been, the watchwords.

Conversion by the military to natural gas would have resulted immediately in the unemployment of about 125 men who mine and handle coal which goes to Fort Richardson and Elmendorf Air Force Base. These men are in most cases long-time residents of Alaska. They have families. It is not overstating the case to say that in the area of the mines there is nothing else to provide the kind of economic activity which would permit these men and their dependents to continue to live there. Thus, the making of the appropriation for conversion sought by the Defense Department would have destroyed an industry and would have wrecked the economy of an important section of Alaska.

It is my belief that conversion in the Anchorage area would, in the natural course of events, be followed by similar conversion north of the range at the Fairbanks area bases, so that it would be only a matter of time until Alaska's coal mining industry would be wiped out entirely.

In short, the cost of conversion, \$1,560,000, would not only be a waste of the taxpayers' dollars, but would also lay the foundation for a continued annually greater cost of operation of these military bases which the same taxpayers would be compelled to pay in perpetuity.

What we are dealing with here, Mr. President, is not only a few columns of figures. What we are dealing with is also the destiny of human beings. In addition to the direct effects which I

have been discussing, there would be many incidental and related results, all of them destructive and unfortunate. The Alaska Railroad, owned by the Federal Government, now moves the coal from the mines at Palmer, Eska, and Jonesville to the bases. This transportation activity makes possible a quality and frequency of railroad service and a level of rates on commodities other than coal which the people of Alaska—although they often grumble about them—have managed to tolerate. Removal of the coal-transportation activity would hurt the railroad and also would hurt the people of Alaska who depend upon its rates and services. An alternative, which I hardly think the Bureau of the Budget or the Congress would look upon with great favor, would be to subsidize the operation of this Government-owned railroad, in order to make up for the losses of traffic. This would, indeed, be robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The computations, on which the supposed saving to the Federal Government from conversion were based, relied on a price of gas of 29 cents a thousand cubic feet delivered to the Defense Department. No other purchaser, wholesale or retail in Alaska, has up to this time, ever been able to enjoy a gas price that reasonable. There is reason to believe that a realistic price would be about 10 cents higher, or 39 cents a thousand cubic feet. At such a price—which I am fearful the gas supplier would have to move to, in years ahead, in order to remain solvent, there would be no saving at all to Uncle Sam from conversion. In fact, the fuel cost would be higher than the cost of coal has been in the past 2 years. In addition, of course, we would have gone to all of the expense and trouble of converting.

Let us consider what the situation would be after conversion to natural gas at these bases. It is fairly well conceded that in that area petroleum fuels are not competitive. With the coal mines out of business, their plants dismantled, and their employees dispersed, natural gas would be the fuel in the area. Not only the defense bases, but also the private consumers, would be wholly dependent on it, alone. All would have to pay whatever price was demanded. It should be understood that there is no free play of competition in connection with this matter. The pipeline company, which has quoted a gas price to the Defense Department, is the only supplier now in a position, or likely to be in a position in the foreseeable future, to deal with the Government. With coal out of the picture, this natural gas monopoly would completely rule the situation.

I applaud the action of the Armed Services Committee; and I hope this false, alleged economy will now be dropped, not only for the fiscal year ahead, but also for the future.

"FAIR FIGHTS AND FOUL"—BOOK BY JUDGE THURMAN ARNOLD

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, some years ago a "lucky lawyer" came out of my State, and, after serving for a time as a professor of law at Yale, gravitated to Washington, to serve as Assistant Attor-

ney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Later, he sat on the U.S. Court of Appeals, and also founded a significant law firm here in our Nation's Capital.

Judge Thurman Arnold has written of his life—the "life of a lucky lawyer," as he calls it—in a book, just released, entitled "Fair Fights and Foul." An excellent review of the book by a fellow attorney, James Rowe, is published in today's issue of the Washington Post, along with an article based on a recent interview by Morton Mintz. The interview makes the point that Judge Arnold is still quite willing to "light matches in powder mills." I ask unanimous consent that the book review and an article from the Washington Post be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the review and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1966]

THURMAN ARNOLD RIDES AGAIN RELIVING

SPECTACULAR PAST

(Reviewed by James Rowe)

"Fair Fights and Foul," by Thurman Arnold, Harcourt, Brace & World, 292 pages, \$5.95.

Once upon a time, around 1940, there was an iconoclastic Yale law professor who, when sent to Washington, turned into a fearsome dragon. Even today any big businessman over 50 shivers and trembles in his boots at the magic phrase "Thurman Arnold." But the dragon has mellowed since he was the greatest trustbuster of them all, not even excluding his own two great trustbusting heroes, Teddy and Franklin Roosevelt.

So he has written a mellow book. It is as always sardonic, witty, anecdotal and it shines with a literary polish. All this one could expect from the author of the "Folklore of Capitalism," a brilliant pyrotechnic display which burst like the 4th of July over the legal firmament two decades ago.

The difference is that his new book has an increased urbanity. No longer is Arnold indulging in scintillating advocacy for one of his varied causes. Today he is indulging in a review of his attitudes and beliefs. He is looking back and pointing out with a modesty somewhat striking in Thurman Arnold how right he was on the various fields of battle. And incredibly, it does seem he was always right.

There is too little of the unforgettable man, the personality, color and excitement of Thurman Arnold in this book, except for his youth in Wyoming, Princeton, and Harvard Law School, and law practice in Wyoming. After a few years of teaching at Yale Law School, of which he still has a rather high opinion, Arnold took on a variety of legal tasks in Washington.

Then Roosevelt appointed him Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Those, as he says, were the great days; when he led possibly the single most talented staff of lawyers ever seen in Washington. In 4 years he brought more prosecutions for violation of the antitrust law than had taken place during the preceding 50 years. He insists nevertheless that the antitrust law is more important as a symbol of an American belief than it is in practice.

Still this is not simply a book on antitrust law. Arnold has opinions on everything, including working for the Government (which he liked), the Civil Service (which he would abolish because it is inefficient), the Federal court of appeals (on which he sat briefly but left because he knew he was by temperament an advocate and not an impartial judge).

June 24, 1965

He discourses on balanced budgets, Keynesian economics, the printing of money, and fiscal policy, the New Deal and the Great Society, which pleases him greatly.

He expounds a fascinating theory that Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson were the William McChesney Martins of their day and Alexander Hamilton the Leon Keyserling. It may be true but, as he has said in other connections, it will take generations before this theory becomes general belief.

For many years the author has been in Washington private practice. Although he discourses happily about law firms and law schools, the book spends no time on the cases which have made him a successful corporate lawyer. He prefers his "public" cases—Esquire, Playboy, and obscenity, the Lattimore case, and the Bailey and Peters cases.

He does not refrain from paying his due respects to the memory of Senator Joseph McCarthy and to timorous Government executives.

He tells about his rescue of poet Ezra Pound from St. Elizabeths and from trial for treason.

It would have been fun if he had put more of himself, rather than his ideas, into the telling. But the ideas and the causes are fascinating and interesting enough for everyone, not only the lawyer but also the historian, the sociologist, psychologist, and even the general reader.

It is quite clear that this dragon lived happily ever after.

STILL ICONOCLASTIC JUDGE ARNOLD CALLS CIVIL SERVICE A HANDICAP (By Morton Mintz)

After Thurman W. Arnold took over the Justice Department's Antitrust Division during the New Deal, he says in his new book, "indictments of respectable people began to pour out.

He prosecuted oil firms, General Electric the American Medical Association, the Associated Press.

"Cries of outrage could be heard from coast to coast," Arnold writes in "Fair Fights and Foul," which Harcourt, Brace & World is publishing today.

"I was pictured as a wild man whose sanity was in considerable doubt. One major newspaper referred to me as 'an idiot in a powder mill'."

Arnold is now 74, founding (and active) partner in the influential law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter and basking in prestige. He is addressed by many as "Judge," having served on the U.S. court of appeals here.

But the willingness to light matches in powder mills—for what Arnold deems good and sufficient reason—is still there. It burned brightly in an interview the other day.

There is, he said, "no justification any more" for the civil service. This brought a lighted match closer to the powder than does his book, in which he is content to call it "a serious handicap to Government efficiency."

SURVIVES AS A SYMBOL

Interview or book, his objections are the same. Civil service, he says, survives "as a symbol of the Government's fairness to its employees." But, he writes in "Fair Fights," the symbol has little relation to reality:

Civil service affords practically no protection in the tenure of Government service. The head of a department, if he is conscientious, can always get rid of an employee by the process of a reorganization that abolishes his job.

"If he is not conscientious, he can file a list of charges against an employee, listen to the employee's defense in an absentminded way, and then fire him.

"The employee can appeal to the courts, if he wants to spend his money uselessly * * * I have undertaken cases of dis-

charged employees where I was convinced that the evidence of bias was clear and convincing. I lost them all.

"On the other side of the ledger, civil service puts a handicap on the official's judgment in selecting his staff * * *

"If corporate management had to go through this process of subjecting the personnel and salaries of its staff to some higher authority, even the ordinary citizen unversed in the mysteries of corporate operation would be able to detect that it was nonsense.

"But any kind of restriction on Government management would be regarded by the same citizen as a necessary and wholesome restriction in the interests of preventing Government executives from ruining their own departments by the free exercise of their feeble personal judgments."

SACROSANCT POSITION

"Thus the civil service has acquired an impregnable position in the mind of the public as a symbol of respectability and decorum in the conduct of Government affairs. Anyone who doubts it is apt to be charged with being contemptuous toward holy men."

Here, from the interview, are other matches carried by Arnold to other powder mills:

Little that was taught at Princeton when Arnold was a student there was relevant to the development of the social institutions of the outside world. But faculty members and students in today's teach-ins, seemingly so related to the outside world, are, if anything, even more detached from the realities. Arnold, it should be noted, believes that President Johnson will prove to be "one of the greatest Presidents we have ever known."

Like private industry, Government needs some "cleansing process" to get rid of its incompetent managers. Many of them got where they are because good men, finding that a Government career is not considered "a career of honor" by the people, get out. The people thus have a self-fulfilling prophecy.

"Big business is very inefficient, but is judged by its best examples. Government is very efficient in some things—look at the moonshot—but is judged by its worst examples."

Regulatory agencies become "captives of the people they regulate." The regulators are beset "by the pressures of wanting to be liked by the people they regulate" and from whom they may later seek employment.

So what they do is to turn to "harassment" of the small, rather than the regulation of the big.

Arnold would have liked to title his book "Life of a Lucky Lawyer," but his publisher talked him out of it.

He regrets that he dealt with the late Senator Estes Kefauver in the book solely in the unfavorable context of his crime investigation. In other respects, such as Kefauver's leadership of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, Arnold considers him "a great man," and wishes he had said so.

Finally, he wishes his manuscript deadline had not prevented him from saying more in praise of the performance of President Johnson.

FE

VIETNAM DIALOG

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Washington Star of June 23, in commenting on C.B.S. television, Monday night, upon the debate between proponents and opponents of the administration's Vietnam policy, makes the point that the university professors opposed to the present course of events have offered us nothing which could rationally be described as an alternative.

The editorial also points up the effective and articulate affirmation of our

Government's mission by the President's assistant, McGeorge Bundy, whose appearance served, as the editorial put it, "a useful purpose." The same could be said, I may add, for those on the other side. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Star be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

VIETNAM DIALOG

The "Vietnam dialog" presented by CBS Monday night obviously did not convert any of the professors to the administration's point of view. Nevertheless, the show served a useful purpose.

It demonstrated, for one thing, that McGeorge Bundy is indeed a formidable opponent on the debating platform. He was more than a match for the representatives of the "academic community," singly or collectively. And the President's aid was especially effective in carving up Prof. Hans Morgenthau, who is generally thought of as the guiding spirit of the academic critics of our policy in Vietnam.

More importantly, it demonstrated that you can't beat something with nothing. In this instance, Bundy's something was a clearly articulated definition of the administration's policy and program. The policy has not yet achieved the desired result. But we may know more about its usefulness 6 months from now, and in any event it constitutes a tangible, affirmative course of action which can be stated in terms that are understandable.

The great weakness of the position of the other side was that it offered nothing which could rationally be described as an alternative.

Mr. Morgenthau said he is "opposed to our present policy in Vietnam on moral, military, political and general intellectual grounds"—an interesting rhetorical exercise, but it means little or nothing. He also mentioned five alternatives to our present policy, and said he favored the fifth. What is it? "I think our aim must be to get out of Vietnam," he said, "but to get out of it with honor." This is an alternative? President Johnson has said essentially the same thing on half a dozen occasions.

One thing more. Mr. Morgenthau seemed to take as his model the French withdrawal from Algeria and Vietnam. He failed to mention that in each case the French were waging a purely colonial war, which is quite a different thing from honoring treaty commitments for the sole purpose of helping South Vietnam maintain its independence in the face of plain aggression by the Communists.

FE

THE PROGRESSION IN VIETNAM DEBATE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as one who has taken his stand early and firmly in support of the administration's policies in Vietnam, I have always welcomed debate on the subject, particularly with my colleagues here in the Senate who may disagree, at least on certain points of policy. Such debate is needed, especially in major policy areas.

Nonetheless, Mr. President, Max Freedman, writing in Wednesday's Washington Star, has called attention to the uses to which our adversaries have put some statements of disagreement. His article is worthy of note by the Members of this body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 23, 1965]

THE PROGRESSION IN VIETNAM DEBATE

(By Max Freedman)

In the White House they are drawing up an interesting list of the various stages that have marked the public debate on Vietnam.

First there was the demand for negotiations. This demand died away when the President went to Baltimore and made his offer of unconditional discussions.

Then there was the campaign for a pause in the bombing. When President Johnson, ordered this pause and nothing happened to bring the Communists to the conference table, the agitation became far less vehement.

Now there is a demand for direct negotiations with the Vietcong. The White House is struck by the progression of these demands. The argument moves from a simple request for negotiations, to a campaign against bombing raids on North Vietnam, to a demand for a negotiated settlement based on direct talks with the Communist guerrilla forces in South Vietnam. Always the pressure is on the United States to make the first concessions to the Communists.

In pointing to these facts, White House officials make no criticism of the group of Democratic Senators who have become the public opponents of U.S. policies in Vietnam. The President himself has acknowledged that these Senators have both "the right and the duty" to express their convictions on such a major aspect of U.S. policy. Officials in the White House are not opposed to criticism. They are wondering instead whether the critics are sufficiently aware of the uses to which their protests have been put by the Communist side.

Instead of persuading the Communists that the time had come to seek a negotiated settlement, these American criticisms have had the opposite effect. They have hardened the Communist military campaign, led them to hope that the United States may yet become grievously divided, and pushed the Communists further away from the conference room.

Over the weekend President Ho Chi Minh of North Vietnam was quoted in Pravda as saying that the Communist military effort is receiving encouragement from the criticisms heard inside the United States.

Now the last thought in the mind of any Senator is to say or do anything that will bring aid and comfort to the Communists. Not a single critical Senator is trying to help the Communist side. Without exception all of them are trying to save the United States from following a path that they conceive to be full of mischief and danger. Their convictions command respect even when they do not carry agreement; for it is never easy to stand out against a mounting war fever.

But it cannot be challenged by anyone who has studied the uses made in Hanoi and Peiping of the senatorial criticisms that they have an impact which quite often mocks the purposes of the speakers. These Senators are men of experience and patriotism. It surely should be possible for them, within the traditions of responsible debate, to criticize their own government without giving comfort and encouragement to the Communists. After all, they could have been no happier than the White House with Ho Chi Minh's interview with Pravda.

Incidentally, far too much has been made of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's meeting with the President before his recent speech in the Senate. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Arkansas Democrat has his own constitutional duties

to discharge. His ability to command a national or indeed a world audience does not depend on his being a spokesman for the White House. It depends on his own intrinsic wisdom. No body understands this better than the President.

That being clearly understood, it should be added that it is utter nonsense for the Republican Party to pretend that FULBRIGHT is challenging the President's program. Johnson is pledged to a policy of unconditional discussions. That means he is ready to go to the conference table without preconditions of any kind. He is ready to listen to everything without agreeing to anything in advance.

Quite plainly there can be no settlement, as FULBRIGHT has said, without concessions from both sides. The President has no quarrel at all with that position. He merely reserves the right to decide for himself at the proper time what precise concessions are in fact essential to a settlement. He would like that fact to be thoroughly understood here no less than by the Communists.

THE LAKE POWELL BOOKLET

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I read with considerable astonishment a speech made on June 7 in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, in attacking the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior for issuing a booklet of color photographs of Lake Powell, the lake created by construction of the Glen Canyon Dam.

Although this is one of the most spectacular and inviting of the Nation's new playgrounds, and one which makes a mighty contribution toward meeting the recreational needs of our growing population, Representative SAYLOR calls the Lake Powell booklet a "blatantly illegal lobbying campaign." He sees in it an effort by the Bureau of Reclamation to promote other Colorado River reclamation legislation which will create similar lakes which can be used for recreation.

In view of the strong language Representative SAYLOR used on June 7 in criticizing the Lake Powell booklet and its publication by a bureau of the Department of the Interior, I did a "double take" when, some 5 days later, on June 12, I was handed a very attractive and artistic booklet on the proposal to establish Tocks Island National Recreation Area in Representative SAYLOR's State of Pennsylvania and the neighboring State of New Jersey. The Tocks Island booklet was likewise published by one of the bureaus of the Department of the Interior—in this instance, the National Park Service. The only difference is that the Tocks Island book is provided free, while the Lake Powell book is sold by the Government Printing Office for 75 cents a copy. A copy of the Tocks Island booklet was given to me when I made a Senate Interior Committee field trip, on Saturday, to Pennsylvania and New Jersey, to see, with the committee, the section which would be created as Tocks Island National Recreation Area, by means of a bill which Representative SAYLOR has introduced.

I noted immediately a number of similarities between the Tocks Island recreation area and the Glen Canyon

recreation area. Both will be built around an artificial lake to be formed by a reservoir, and both will be constructed by the Federal Government. In the case of Tocks Island, the reservoir will be constructed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Glen Canyon has been built by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. Tocks Island is somewhat smaller than the Glen Canyon recreation area, but would be developed for the same purpose—to provide recreation for the approximately 30 million people who live within 100 miles of the area. There are not that many people, of course, living that close to Lake Powell; but, over a period of time, it will undoubtedly attract far more than 30 million to enjoy its unique beauty.

The pamphlet describing Tocks Island is not, I admit, fully in color; but it is handsome, nonetheless, with a two-color cover and double-page map, and with stunning halftones and glowing prose. It is without question a "sales pamphlet" for Tocks Island.

It happens that I favor the establishment of the Tocks Island recreation area; and I shall do what I can to see that it becomes a reality, by voting either for Representative SAYLOR's bill or for the companion bill introduced by Senator CLARK, whichever comes before me.

As a matter of fact, I am in favor of extending our present system of parks and seashores and monuments and recreation areas as rapidly as we can investigate appropriate areas and can assure ourselves that they meet the necessary criteria. I am convinced that our population growth makes it mandatory that we provide more outdoor recreation sites, and that we must set aside those sites now, before they are swallowed up by expanding industry and agriculture or by urban sprawl.

I have no objection, as Representative SAYLOR does, if the publications of the Department of the Interior explain the merits of an area before it is established, or after it is ready for visitors. Neither do I object, as Representative SAYLOR does, if the booklet also looks to the future, by discussing the potentialities of other sites in the area which might become available for recreation if dams are built by the Corps of Engineers or by the Bureau of Reclamation. The American people are interested in what their Government is doing for them, and how it is being financed, and what it proposes to do in the future, and how those plans will be financed.

I believe that most of the nature lovers and conservationists in the country feel the same as I do about developing recreation sites as a "new part" of our heritage of natural beauty. This is put very well in the closing paragraphs of the Lake Powell booklet, which I shall quote:

There is a natural order in our universe. God created both man and nature. And man served God. But nature serves man.

Man cannot improve upon nature. But, as he has since the dawn of history, man must continue to adapt nature to his needs. Still, that process of adapting must preserve—in balance—the whole natural heritage that is his.

The Colorado River and its basin are a great and abundant treasure house of natural resources and natural wonders.

Let us husband the one wisely. Let us enjoy the other fully.

AMERICANS "DISCOVER" THE WEST AGAIN

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the June 21 issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an interesting report on a cultural phenomenon which many know as the "rediscovery of the West." It seems that many of our good friends in the East and in the South are only now discovering what we in Wyoming have known for many years; namely, that nowhere on this globe is the sky quite so blue, or are the mountains quite so imposing, the people quite so warm, or the handiwork of a benevolent Creator quite so evident as in the great Rocky Mountain West.

As if the natural beauty and the healthful climate were not enough, travelers to the State of Wyoming will receive an extra measure of western hospitality this year as my fellow Wyomingites celebrate our State's diamond jubilee. Earlier this year, I wrote to each of my colleagues, and suggested that they avail themselves of the pleasure of a visit to the Equality State. I was delighted at the enthusiastic response; and, in that spirit I take this opportunity to remind them that if we who serve in Congress can ever complete our business in the Nation's Capitol, each of us can enjoy part of the summer in wonderful Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Americans 'Discover' the West Again" be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report]

AMERICANS "DISCOVER" THE WEST AGAIN

CODY, Wyo.—An urge on the part of more and more people in the crowded East to get away from it all and to get out into the wide open spaces is being noted in new areas of the American West.

Earlier, this urge led to the upbuilding of California and the Pacific coast. Then the same urge sparked a boom in the desert States.

Now there is an upsurge of interest in the mountain West—a region of rugged beauty and grandeur that stretches away to the west and northwest of a line drawn from the foothills of the Colorado Rockies to South Dakota's Black Hills.

THEY COME, THEY SEE, AND—

This new boom goes beyond tourism. People often come first on a sightseeing trip, like what they see, and then buy or build vacation homes to which they return year after year. Some even cut loose from careers in the East and move west to stay.

The future of the boom in the mountain West, say those who are watching it grow, is assured by the fact that vast areas of wilderness and scenic beauty have been set aside permanently in national parks, forests, and monuments.

"Remember this," says a Cody man who was born and raised in the high country of Wyoming: "You don't have to worry about this country being overrun and desecrated. The Government has most of it nailed down."

More than half the land in the Western States is U.S. owned. Now the scramble is

on for the limited amount of private land that gives access to the Government parks and forests.

FIVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS A HALF ACRE

One striking example of this scramble is found at Jackson, county seat of Teton County. In that county, 97 percent of the land is U.S. owned. The small enclave of private land in an area known as Jackson Hole is surrounded by the Grand Teton National Park, Teton National Forest, and Bridger National Forest.

"Land in this valley can't be touched for much less than \$1,000 an acre now," says Warren O. Erbe, a real estate agent in Jackson. "A small piece of land just south of town was subdivided in the spring of 1964, and lots of about half an acre in size were offered for \$3,000 apiece. Now the price has jumped to \$5,500."

A group of Jackson businessmen has bought 360 acres about 5 miles south of Jackson. The land is to be subdivided into building sites of about 4 acres. People who build homes on these lots will be able to arrange with a development company for year-round management that will include renting the homes to other vacationers and protecting and maintaining them.

Jackson Hole is billed as a year-round recreation center. One ski area has been operating for several years. Now a second ski layout is under construction on a former dude ranch that lies up against the Grand Teton Mountains. Lots for individual homes have been platted on land at the base of the new ski operation, and several have already been snapped up by out-of-town buyers.

A boomlet more modest than that around Jackson Hole is underway about 40 miles to the southwest in the area of Alpine Junction. Here there is a limited amount of non-Federal land available along the Pallsades Reservoir.

Natives of the Pallsades area tick off its attractions: (1) three national forests—Caribou, Bridger, and Targhee; (2) fishing in four rivers that run into the reservoir—the Snake, the Salt, the Grays, and McCoy Creek; (3) a ski slope and lift that will open next winter; (4) hunting in the autumn—elk, deer, duck, geese.

Though well-known attractions of the mountain West, such as the Grand Tetons and Yellowstone Park, are getting more crowded every year along their main highways, outdoorsmen say you don't have to venture far off the beaten track to find real wilderness.

"I've fished for 2 or 3 days at a time in the Jackson Hole and Yellowstone country and never saw a soul," says Dean Krakel, a native westerner who now is director of the "Cowboy Hall of Fame" in Oklahoma City. And, Mr. Krakel adds, "I've camped in the North Park country of Colorado for a week at a time in absolute solitude."

A BIGGER SKY

Ask Mr. Krakel what accounts for the growing interest in the Mountain West, and he gives this answer:

"I think it's because a lot of people are reasserting a certain amount of individualism. You feel more like an individual out West. The wind blows a little harder, it's colder, the sky is bigger.

"The people you meet in the West are different. They walk differently, and they're in less of a hurry. And the concepts of time and of space are considerably different. As one old fellow said to me: 'It's 15 miles from my place to the mailbox, and it's a long ways from there into town.'"

Summing up his answer, Mr. Krakel says: "Westerners are more conscious of what the weather is doing. They are more self-sufficient and more independent. Friendship is

more open. When you come to a ranch, you are expected to spend some time there."

Areas of the Mountain West once considered remote now are being opened up. One such area is the North Park country of Colorado mentioned by Mr. Krakel. This region lies to the northwest of Denver.

At Walden, Colo., Mayor Herbert W. Berry has this comment:

"We are beginning to get quite a play from people coming in looking for a piece of land. Of course, one problem is that so much of the land around here is in national forests, but there are some cabin sites available."

To the north of Walden, on the Wyoming side of the border, some developments similar to those around Jackson Hole are underway.

In southern Montana, at Red Lodge, the same story of a scramble for private land adjacent to wilderness attractions set aside by the Government is found.

Red Lodge is situated at one gateway to the Custer National Forest, which holds the spectacular Beartooth Mountains. In these mountains is one of the 51 "wilderness areas" set aside in the Western States by Congress in 1964.

A second ski layout will open near Red Lodge this winter. A finger of privately owned land extending along Rock Creek up to the entrance to the Custer Forest is now being subdivided. On up the Rock Creek Canyon about 60 miles is the Cooke City entrance to Yellowstone National Park.

Commenting on renewed interest in the Mountain West, Dr. Harold McCracken, director of the Whitney Gallery of Western Art in Cody, says:

"I can't count the number of people who come through the gallery and ask me where they can find a piece of land in this country. They express a strong desire to get away from the problems of cities and their suburbs."

Cody has been a tourist attraction ever since "Buffalo Bill" Cody gave the town its name by settling there after his days as a scout during the Indian wars. Until recently, much of the demand for land in the Cody area has come from people able to buy sizable acreage. Now, however, a Cody real estate man reports that pressure is growing to subdivide ranchland along the south fork of the Shoshone River.

New highways and airports are making the Mountain West more accessible. A paved runway is being added to the airport at Walden in the North Park country, and this area is also to get some new and improved highways. Cody plans to lengthen the runway at its airport. Red Lodge opened a new mile-long runway in 1964.

WARM WORDS FROM NEWCOMERS

People who have given up careers to move west say they have no regrets.

"My income this year will be about a third of what it was, but I get to see three times as much of my family," said a young physician who gave up a practice in Philadelphia to move to Cody. "The children like the schools and their new friends. My wife has learned to ski. You couldn't get her out of here with a stick of dynamite."

Another factor in the upsurge of interest in the Mountain West is explained by a developer at Jackson:

"Americans have more discretionary income to spend than ever before. With the tax break you get on vacation property, many find that they are able to afford a second home in the Rockies."

The "tax break" this developer mentioned stems from regulations of the Internal Revenue Service that permit depreciation allowances for vacation homes if they are rented part time and thus become income-producing property.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ailsa Alexandra MacIntyre."

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to waive the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who is afflicted with epilepsy in behalf of the fiancé of a U.S. citizen veteran of our Armed Forces. The bill will enable her to enter the United States for the purpose of marriage and to thereafter reside permanently in the United States. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents.

JOANNA K. GEORGOULIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Joana K. Georgoulia which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "Act," to strike out "Joana" and insert "Joanna"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "Joana" and insert "Joanna"; and in the same line, after the word "by", to strike out "Mr. George H. Jules, a citizen" and insert "Mr. and Mrs. George H. Jules, citizens"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joanna K. Georgoulia may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Joanna K. Georgoulia by Mr. and Mrs. George H. Jules, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia."

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant to the alien child to be adopted by citizens of the United States the status of a nonquota immigrant. The bill also provides for the filing of an eligible orphan visa petition in her behalf by her prospective adoptive parents. The amendments are technical in nature.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar. I wish to express my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Idaho for his courtesy.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] again yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho is about to make a most important speech. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERMS OF MEMBERS OF FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 353, H.R. 5988.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5988) to provide that Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall hereafter be appointed for a term of 5 years, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 364), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this legislation is to change the term of office of Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission from 4 years to 5 years and to provide that a Commissioner whose term has expired will serve until his successor has been nominated and approved with the advice and consent of the Senate.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under the present law the Federal Maritime Commission is composed of five members, each appointed for a 4-year term. Therefore, the terms of two Commissioners expire simultaneously. This situation could create a serious problem by preventing the continuity of service which is essential in any regulatory commission. The legislation would have no effect on the 4-year terms of Commissioners presently serving.

The problem of a possible lack of continuity could be seriously aggravated under the present law by the absence of any provision which authorizes Commissioners to continue to serve until their successor has been nominated and approved by the Senate. This standard provision is found in the basic law establishing the terms of Commissioners on other regulatory agencies. This bill would extend that provision to appointments made to the Federal Maritime Commission.

This aspect of the problem is particularly acute at the present time because the terms of office of the Chairman and of another member of the Federal Maritime Commission expire on July 1 of this year. If these offices are not filled under the present law by that date, no action could be taken by the remaining three Commissioners except by unanimous consent until the vacancies are filled. This undesirable situation could be avoided by prompt enactment of the bill.

The Federal Maritime Commission was

created by Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961. Pursuant to the procedures applicable to congressional consideration of executive reorganization proposals in this form, no amendments could be made at the time Congress considered the proposal. This restriction has contributed to the seriousness of the problem created by the provisions of the reorganization plan.

The legislation was introduced at the request of the Federal Maritime Commission. Favorable reports have been received by all agencies concerned. Hearings were held by the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the companion bill, S. 1348, on May 25 and no opposition was expressed.

FE  Church
THE VIETNAM IMBROGLIO

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, on February 17, I spoke in this Chamber to urge a negotiated settlement of the war in Vietnam. At that time, negotiation was a dirty word in Washington; since that time, I am gratified that a negotiated peace has been expressly made the object of American policy in southeast Asia.

In view of the expanding nature of our military involvement in South Vietnam, it is difficult to see how the Vietcong can expect to score a conclusive military decision. On the other hand, any quest on our part for a durable victory on the battlefield is equally dubious. Senator FULBRIGHT, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, wisely summed up the matter last week, in these words:

It is clear to all reasonable Americans that a complete military victory in Vietnam, though theoretically attainable, can in fact be attained only at a cost far exceeding our interest and our honor.

With this statement, I am in full agreement. It obviously serves the American interest to reach a political settlement in Vietnam, whenever this can be accomplished on acceptable terms, and in a manner consistent with the commitments we have given to the Saigon government.

Now that this objective has become our avowed goal, there is a very real need for us to discuss, here in the Senate, in this historic forum of free and open debate, not only the direction of our policy, but new steps that might be taken in pursuit of a negotiated peace. To remain silent, when the prospect of a widening war confronts us, would be to shirk our duty; worse still, it would be to behave like a mock parliament of a totalitarian state.

Let me make my own position plain. In the past, beginning more than a year ago, I have publicly criticized American policy in Asia. But, in his handling of our predicament in Vietnam, I have not criticized the President. I realize that Lyndon Johnson is in the position of a man being asked to unscramble an omelet, many years in the baking. He is a man of peace, and he has been working ceaselessly to restore peace in southeast Asia.

Like Kennedy before him, President Johnson inherited an American obligation in South Vietnam, which must, and will, be honored. Often he has stressed

that we seek no wider war, but in the face of mounting Vietcong pressure against the embattled Saigon government, the President has also emphasized that "we do not plan to come running home and abandon this little nation, or tear up our commitments, or go back on our word."

I fully support the President in this position. I have consistently backed him in the stepped-up military action he has ordered, including the bombing of supply routes in North Vietnam. These bombings, together with the American troop movements into South Vietnam presently taking place, should make it abundantly clear that the vast resources of the United States are now fully arrayed behind Saigon.

THE STUBBORN WAR

Within the past few weeks, American military strength in South Vietnam has doubled; at the present rate of input, it will double again before the end of the year. Our bombing of the north, once sporadic, has become systematic. The mission of our combat troops, once confined to sentinel duty at a few air bases, steadily expands toward a general American engagement in the war. We have too much muscle power to be driven out. We are capable of occupying and holding South Vietnam with our own military might. Hanoi cannot possibly defeat the United States.

Yet the war goes on.

Last April, in his notable peace-seeking address at Johns Hopkins, President Johnson threw open the door to the conference table by announcing his readiness to commence "unconditional discussions with the governments concerned." He declared that "the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement." The terms he offered were anything but onerous.

He said:

Such peace demands an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country.

By the standards of past wars, these are unusually generous terms. North Vietnam would escape unpunished for her aggression. An independent, non-aligned South Vietnam would pose no threat to Hanoi. Moreover, such a settlement would bring about the orderly withdrawal of American troops from southeast Asia, for which the Communists have long and loudly campaigned.

Yet the war goes on.

This obstinate Communist refusal to end the shooting is all the more vexatious in face of Johnson's indicated readiness to contribute a billion dollars, once peace is restored, toward an international co-operative effort to develop the mighty Mekong River. The great rewards of such an enterprise—including electric power—could be fully shared by North Vietnam, as well as South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. The President has made clear:

We would hope that North Vietnam would take its place in the common effort just as soon as peaceful cooperation is possible.

Obviously, the words of peace cannot begin in earnest until the wastes of war have ended.

Yet the war goes on.

Two explanations, both of which deserve careful assessment, suggest themselves: First, Hanoi still anticipates victory on her own terms, despite Saigon's success in securing the United States as a fighting partner; and, second, Peiping presses for a prolonged war as the best device available for advancing China's larger ambitions in Asia.

THE VIEW FROM HANOI

If Hanoi's intransigence is rooted to the belief that the Vietcong will eventually prevail, what accounts for it? The answer given widest favor in this country is that Ho Chi Minh feels that we will grow weary of the war, and that American public opinion will then force us to pull out. Accordingly, homefront critics of our Vietnamese policy are admonished that their complaints will be interpreted in Hanoi as proof of our waning resolution. Students and faculty on our campuses, protesting the deepening American involvement in an Asian war, are scolded for giving false hopes to the enemy. Presumably, nothing less than total conformity of opinion throughout the United States will suffice to persuade Ho Chi Minh that our country will not soon abandon the Saigon government.

Undoubtedly, the college "teach-ins," the protest rallies, and the occasional picket lines demanding our withdrawal, are sources of encouragement for Hanoi. But since when have free people not behaved this way? Only dictatorships stifle dissent. As long as Americans stay free, differences of opinion, on foreign as well as domestic issues, will continue to be vigorously and openly expressed. Any American foreign policy which depends, for success, upon a monolithic acceptance at home is foreordained to failure.

However, this argument, so well designed to dampen homefront opposition, is much too convenient to be very convincing. Hanoi is surely aware that the United States has yet to quit a fight. In two World Wars, we settled for nothing less than unconditional surrender; in the Korean war, we fought on against the onslaught of Red China until all of South Korea was resecured. Never have we shown a lack of staying power under fire.

Besides, the President himself has made it unquestionably clear that the United States will "stay the course" in Vietnam. His words are as irreversible as his deeds:

We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement.

His pledge is sealed with American blood already drawn. The whole world bears him witness.

Congress has also made its position apparent. By nearly unanimous votes, the members of both parties have given unmistakable evidence of their willingness to supply whatever money the war may require. Our annual outlay, which until recent years was \$200 million, has risen to \$2 billion. If the burden were to again increase 10-fold, it is evident that Congress would readily vote the funds.

Indeed, the case is so lopsided that it should be plain by now, even to the most indoctrinated Communist, that the ex-

panding military involvement of the United States cannot be dismissed as some sort of death agony, staged to give temporary cover to an impending American withdrawal from southeast Asia.

It is far more likely that Ho Chi Minh is counting not so much on Washington as on Saigon itself to call it quits. And with some reason. An endemic instability engulfs the city. One coup follows another with such frequency that correspondence with the Government might well be addressed: "To Whom It May Concern."

President Johnson cannot unite the spoiling factions. A competent and effective government in Saigon, capable of giving sustained direction to the war, can only be established by the Vietnamese themselves. They keep failing the test; no formula for stability emerges; no bonds endure between the Buddhists, the Catholics, and the self-seeking military rivals. The political situation seems to worsen day by day.

Under the circumstances, it is small wonder that public confidence crumbles away, or that this erosion should be further aggravated by the changing face of the war. For the more the war is transformed into an American engagement on the mainland of Asia, pitting the West against the East, white men against brown, the more the fighting takes on the outer appearance of the former war for independence against the French. In the countryside of Vietnam—and those who have been there as I have, will readily testify that this is the case—the level of sophistication is very low. Inhabitants of the rice fields and jungles, where the guerrilla war exists, are apt to mark an enemy more by the color of his skin than the uniform he wears. As larger numbers of Americans move in and take over, as the changing complexion of the war becomes more evident, Ho Chi Minh may well surmise that time plays on his side.

He may anticipate, as the months go by, that the incessant propaganda campaign of the Vietcong is bound to sound more plausible and appealing; that the Americans have come to reimpose the hated imperialism of the past; that the generals rotating on the roost in Saigon are contemptible puppets; that the people must join together in one great liberation front.

The continuing war, moreover, may bludgeon into the arms of the Vietcong a multitude that cannot be beckoned in. The guerrilla fighter is ruthless, but he kills with cunning, discriminating between friend, follower, and foe. Not so with napalm dropped on a native village—it burns blindly and converts all suffering survivors into foes. An American veteran of the jungle fighting in Vietnam has well observed that the best weapon for successfully prosecuting a guerrilla war is a knife; the worst, an airplane.

So there are good reasons for Ho Chi Minh to play a waiting game. The Vietcong grow stronger. Saigon staggers under mounting blows. If a protracted war involving increased numbers of American troops will win the Communists added favor among the people, the temptation to persist is compelling. After all, the American presence in South Vietnam

will become very awkward, if not untenable, once it is no longer possible to tell the enemy apart from the people. Then, Hanoi may well reason, peace will come on her terms.

THE PRESSURE FROM PEIPING

There is also a heavy external pressure upon Hanoi to carry on, imposed from two directions—by the Vietcong doing the fighting, and by Red China, the chief beneficiary of the fighting. Every day it is clearer that the Chinese, above all others, want to see the war prolonged. Peiping exhorts Hanoi to keep up the fight and taunts us to do likewise with "paper tiger" insults. Among all Communist leaders, it is Mao Tse-tung who most adamantly opposes any negotiations. He wants the war to continue, because the longer the conflict lasts, the better China is served.

Our failure to comprehend, long ago, Mao's shrewd appraisal of the war in Indochina, has proved a great misfortune. It has enabled him to use us, along with the Vietnamese, to further his designs on Asia.

These designs are well enough known. As the giant of Asia, unfettered of her colonial bonds, China is determined to reclaim her place as the dominant power of the mainland. She would redraw old boundary lines, dating back to the ancient empire, through the assertion of claims which have nothing to do with communism. For example, less than 3 years ago, in the border dispute with India, Chiang Kai-shek publicly affirmed China's right to the territory sought by Mao. As with the Soviet Union, the territorial aspirations of Red China spring more from national tradition than from the doctrines of Marx or Lenin.

And, just as the Communist leaders in the Kremlin, following the Second World War, reimposed the Russian sphere of influence over the Balkans, earlier existing under the czars, so the Reds in Peiping, after 1954, have sought to reestablish over Indochina the sphere of influence so long enjoyed by the Chinese emperors. This region, in fact, bears a resemblance to the Balkans, consisting as it does of small, bordering countries, over which China looms like a dragon above a handful of lizards.

In the natural course of events, we cannot hope to deny China her influence in southeast Asia, any more than China can deny us ours in the Caribbean. The best we can do is to slow down the Chinese penetration, so that the larger of her neighbors, countries like India and Pakistan, can gather the strength necessary to furnish the mainland of Asia with an effective counterpoise to Chinese power.

Unfortunately, the American involvement in a protracted war in "the Balkans of Asia" works directly against these ends. As most Asians are inclined to see it, the United States has intervened in a war that is primarily a Vietnamese affair, regardless of whether the struggle is viewed as an insurrection in the south, or a covert war by the north against the south. Either way, American troops, not Chinese, are in the fight; American planes, not Chinese, are doing the bombing. Whatever aid China has given Hanoi is outweighed many times over by

the weapons, food, training, and supplies, given Saigon by the United States. Thus, to much of Afro-Asia, the war seems a mismatch, with the rich and mighty American Nation cast in the role of bully, while struggling little North Vietnam plays the stalwart underdog. Hanoi, after all, is not about to take over the world.

So it is that American participation in the Vietnamese war is actually working against our larger interests in Asia. The longer it lasts, the more convincing China appears as the self-styled champion of Asia for the Asians; the faster Chinese influence in neighboring lands spreads from a trickle to a tide, gathering in such smaller countries as Burma and Cambodia, and provoking such larger countries as India and Pakistan into open criticism of American policy.

China also gains in other ways. Prolonging the war makes Hanoi increasingly dependent upon China for weapons and supplies, compromising her hard-won independence. Within the Communist camp, the continuing war can be pointed to by China as proof that the Russian argument for peaceful coexistence with the West is absurd, while within China itself, the daily tongue lashings administered to the "American devils in Vietnam" furnish the Red government with a convenient whipping post around which to rally the people to greater endeavor at home.

THE SEARCH FOR A SOLUTION

Much as we need a solution, it will not be found in retreat. Were we to decide to abandon South Vietnam after so lavishly committing our prestige there, our withdrawal would surely undermine confidence in the United States throughout the Far East. Other little countries which now rely on us, like Thailand, Laos, and even Taiwan, would be demoralized. China would profit most from the triumph of the Vietcong which would soon follow an American decision to give up the fight in South Vietnam.

Therefore, we must remain in the war until a basis for its settlement is found. But let us concentrate our attention, and our military action as well, in South Vietnam, where the outcome will be determined anyhow.

The war in Vietnam is as much a political struggle as it is a military one. Indeed, I think if we looked at it closely we would decide to concentrate more work in the political and economic areas to help meet the threat of the Vietcong. As our former Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, said during his tour of duty in Saigon:

The Vietcong campaign is, above all, a political affair. When the Vietcong have had enough and decide to stop fighting, they simply melt in with the people. If the people were to deny the Vietcong, they would thus have no base; they would be through.

The essentially political nature of the struggle has led American officials who know most about the situation to correctly observe that the present conflict is essentially a South Vietnamese war which can only be won by the South Vietnamese themselves. As President Kennedy said shortly before his death:

In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam against the Communists.

Those who argue expansion of aerial attacks to the north misunderstand the nature of the situation. As leading spokesmen for the administration have noted, the basic problem is in the south. Although aerial attacks on the north may slow down supplies, they are no substitute for effective military and political action on the ground of South Vietnam itself. Further acceleration of the war northward should be resolutely resisted. Otherwise, the time will come when Communist China feels obliged to enter the war.

If that were to happen, the dimensions of the calamity would be mammoth. Undoubtedly, given our heavy dependence upon naval and aerial power, we would attempt to confine the land war to southeast Asia, where Chinese armies would soon fill the jungles. We would strike back through the air, observing no sanctuary, but as long as we used conventional weapons, we could never subdue China through bombing alone.

By sending five or six combat divisions into battle—the balance of our uncommitted army—we could probably convert South Vietnam into an American military outpost. A stalemate would develop, and, finally, in order to end the attrition, we would negotiate a truce with Red China, much as we did in Korea. The truce would conform with the realities of the situation, leaving us in possession of South Vietnam, and the Communists in occupation and control of the rest of Indochina.

Beyond southeast Asia, on the broad global front, the intensified struggle in Vietnam could yet lead to a shotgun marriage between the feuding titans of the Communist world. The promising thaw in our relations with the Soviet Union will then give way to a full resumption of the cold war, with our adversaries joined together again in common cause. This may still be a part of the price we shall pay for the corner into which we have been painted in Indochina.

These, then, are the two horns of our dilemma: If we abandon the war in Vietnam, China gains; if we fight it out, China also gains. Why should not Mao Tse-tung work so feverishly against a negotiated settlement? It is the one escape hatch which may still be within our reach.

Seymour Topping, writing from Saigon for the New York Times, confirms this analysis by observing that President Johnson's offer for unconditional peace talks was a blow to Red China. Topping writes:

Peiping's propaganda denunciation of the "negotiations plot" has been almost hysterical. Acceptance by Hanoi of this offer would mean the strengthening of the positions in southeast Asia of Peiping's two chief adversaries, the United States and the Soviet Union.

THREE PROPOSALS FOR ACTION

It is already very late. We should waste no time on recriminations over

June 24, 1965

past mistakes which may have led us into the Vietnam imbroglio. The uppermost requirement now is to find a solution. How do we bring Hanoi to the conference table ready to settle on honorable terms? The answer, if there is one, must lie in the calculated use of the mailed fist and the velvet glove.

Admittedly, the stepped-up American military pressure is intended to summon Hanoi to the conference table. But this alone will not suffice. It is obvious that further diplomatic moves are called for.

I would propose:

First. That we abandon our unilateral posture in Vietnam by soliciting the services of the United Nations in the search for a peaceful settlement.

Second. That we affirm our willingness to deal with representatives of the Vietcong, as part of any delegation Hanoi may send to the conference table.

Third. That we advocate genuine self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, as the basis for an agreement settling the war.

These proposals should be additional to, not substitutes for, the terms of peace offered by President Johnson in his laudable Johns Hopkins address. Naturally, we should continue to reiterate the President's declaration that we want no military foothold in Indochina nor alliances there—that our objective is independence and neutrality for the countries of the region and nothing more.

The method we should adopt, the tactics we should employ, in attempting to engage the services of the United Nations, are matters for the State Department. Whether we should try, under U.N. auspices, to reconvene the original signatories to the Geneva accords, or seek direct U.N. intervention through the Security Council, or whether we should pursue Secretary General U Thant's intimation that the good offices of the U.N. might be utilized to mediate the dispute, are matters that cannot be resolved here. But this war does threaten world peace, and the U.N. did intervene to restore internal order in the Congo. The situation in Vietnam is sufficiently similar to make the crisis there an entirely appropriate subject for U.N. action.

Indeed, our failure to take the controversy to the U.N. long ago is a puzzle. It is said that the U.N. faces bankruptcy from past peacekeeping missions, and is quite unable to assume further burdens. Yet, a U.N. peace force in South Vietnam could be financed by voluntary contributions, the same as other ventures in the past. Even if the United States had to pay the bulk of the cost, the amount would be less than our present outlay.

It is also said that if we were to ask for U.N. intervention in the Security Council, Russia would probably veto the proposal. Perhaps this would happen, perhaps not. The Soviet Union has cause to want China restrained in southeast Asia, and the U.N. could well represent the most acceptable means available. But if Russia were to veto our proposal, the onus for the continued war would fall on the Communists. Our position would not be weakened but strengthened, the same as the Pres-

ident managed to strengthen it some 4 months ago, by making his still-unaccepted proposal for unconditional peace talks. If the Communists are determined for the war to last, we can at least keep placing the responsibility where it belongs—squarely on their backs.

Another argument, often used to cast scorn upon any suggested resort to the United Nations, is to the effect that other countries would send no more than token forces anyway, so that the United States would still have to bear the brunt of what Secretary Rusk has called "a mean, dirty war." That, of course, was the case in Korea, but conducting the campaign there under the U.N. flag proved a great advantage to the United States. The same would hold true in Vietnam.

Until recently, even more curious than our failure to turn to the U.N. has been the evident disdain we have shown for any contact with the Vietcong. Officially, we cannot extend to the Vietcong the autonomous recognition they desire, because we see the war as a case of indirect aggression by the north against the south, and regard the Vietcong—including its many members who are residents of the south—as merely the agents of Hanoi.

Nevertheless, there is nothing in our theory of the war to preclude Hanoi from including representatives of the Vietcong in any delegation the Government of North Vietnam may send to the conference table. In fact, the inclusion would tend to bear out our official viewpoint. Recognition of this, at long last, may account for the slow melt in our frozen posture which now appears to be taking place. Secretary Rusk has indicated, in response to recent inquiries, that he would not interpose an objection if Hanoi chose to include Vietcong spokesmen among her representatives. I think we should affirmatively declare our willingness to deal with the Vietcong on this basis. For too long, we have sought to exclude them entirely, though they are the very combatants opposing us, a posture so rigid and unreal as to have given a certain currency to the Communist charge that we really do not wish to negotiate.

Though the United States cannot deal directly with the Vietcong, we ought not to oppose peace talks among the Vietnamese themselves. The warring factions—Saigon, the Vietcong, and Hanoi—should explore the prospects for finding a formula to silence the guns, and to escape the pincers of the great-power squeeze which threatens to undermine the neutrality and independence coveted by all of them.

Finally, I believe that the time is ripe for us to vigorously proclaim the principle of self-determination for the people of South Vietnam. Whether the south should merge with the north under the rule of Hanoi, or remain separated under a government in Saigon, should be decided by popular vote.

The manner and method of the vote would have to be worked out by negotiations. The timing would have to await a cease-fire and the restoration of the requisite internal order. To insure

the integrity of the election, we might propose its supervision by the U.N. If these arrangements could be made, both sides should pledge themselves to abide by the results.

Our belief that Hanoi will never permit free elections in the north—which has often been emphasized as an argument against the proposal—does not justify denying them in the south. We have often asserted that the Vietcong is a militant minority which seeks to forcibly impose its will upon the people of South Vietnam. If this is so, the people themselves will furnish the proof in a competently conducted election; if it is not so, then by what right would we deny the country to Ho Chi Minh?

There are some who ridicule any proposal for a popular referendum upon the ground that the Communists would never agree. All the more reason, I should think, to put them to the test, right out in the open, before the eyes of the watching world. What better way to prove that the Communists are relying on bullets, not ballots, to further their ambitions?

Perhaps the war has gone beyond the turning point. It may be that Hanoi intends to continue the fight, regardless of what we may now do or propose. The conference table may be off in the distance, at the end of a long and tragic trail of casualties still to be suffered. But we cannot know this positively without first making the proposals. If they are rejected, we will have lost nothing for having tried. Our interest calls for no less than a ceaseless effort to find an honorable basis for settling this war.

After all, the future of Asia will not be determined in the jungles of Vietnam. Peiping knows her real rival is New Delhi. Why else did China seek out the opportunity to humiliate India in the border war of 1962? If the future of freedom in Asia is to be decided in any one place, it will be on the Indian subcontinent, not in the little Baikan-type countries of Indochina, where our energies are now being so largely absorbed.

Freedom, as a matter of fact, is not really at issue in South Vietnam, unless we so degrade freedom as to confuse it with the mere absence of communism. Two dictatorial regimes, one sitting in Hanoi, the other in Saigon, struggle for control of the country. Whichever prevails, the outcome is not going to settle the fate of communism in the world at large, nor the problem of guerrilla wars. They did not begin in Vietnam and will not end there. They will continue to erupt in scattered, farflung places around the globe, wherever adverse conditions within a country permit Communist subversion to take root.

Nor can it be soundly contended that the security of the United States requires a military decision in South Vietnam. Our presence in the Far East is not anchored there. Saigon does not stand guard over Seattle. We conquered the Pacific Ocean in the Second World War. It is our moat, the broadest on earth, from the Golden Gate to the very shores of China. There is no way for the landlocked forces of Asia to drive us from the Pacific; there is no need for us to

retain a military base on the mainland of Asia.

So, Madam President, we should hasten to explore any road that might lead to a satisfactory political settlement in Indochina. Hanoi still has reason to bargain, for she covets her independence and has cause to fear China. The same holds true for Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam, all of which have historically resisted Chinese dominion. Even the Soviet Union should have incentive to work for a settlement that will foreclose the prospect of a Chinese occupation of southeast Asia.

Despite the discouragement in the news from Moscow today, in the rejection given the delegation from the Commonwealth countries, which is attempting to find support for a peaceful settlement in southeast Asia, nevertheless it remains true that Russian interests would be served by an end to the war in southeast Asia which so augments Chinese hegemony over the continent.

These propitious factors, still working in our favor, are likely to be the first casualties of a widening war.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, the Senator from Idaho has delivered another thoughtful and balanced analysis of the crisis in Vietnam, one in a series of statements he has made on an equally high plane over the past year on this very important subject.

I said on the floor of the Senate yesterday, following the speech of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], that I believed it to be one of two specially outstanding speeches delivered on the floor of the Senate this year. Many very fine speeches have been delivered, but I thought the speech of the Senator from New York and the speech delivered by the Senator from Idaho several months ago, in which he outlined the dangers of our deepening military involvement in Asia and Africa, constituted two of the very important addresses that have been given this year.

I commend the Senator on his address today, and associate myself with what he has had to say, especially with his point that it is absolutely essential to the national interest that the Senate not shirk its responsibility, but debate this issue fully and extensively, and openly.

I do not agree with the notion that congressional debate in any way undercuts the position of the United States in world affairs.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who is on the floor, answered this contention eloquently several days ago when he said that we should not surrender one of our most precious national privileges, which is the privilege of free debate and free discussion, merely because there are hostile forces in the world who have never known freedom, and who, therefore, do not understand how important free speech is to us.

As the Senator has said, while all of us have great sympathy for the President and want to do what we can to hold up his hand, this does not give us any excuse to remain silent in the face of an issue that affects our constituency and the peace of the world. The President is giving the Nation his energy, his talent and his judgment without stint. Members of the Senate can do no less. We owe it to ourselves and to our constituents and to mankind to speak our convictions and share our insights ever when it takes us on a course that may vary in some degree from the administration position.

I have noted in recent days that there is some feeling in portions of the press and in the executive branch of our Government that perhaps Congress said the last word on Vietnam last August, when we agreed to the Bay of Tonkin resolution, which, we are now told, was a blank check to the administration to do whatever they saw fit in the conduct of this war.

As the Senator from Idaho will remember, that was not the intent in the minds of many Senators at the time the resolution was approved last August.

I have before me an article, taken from the June 18, 1965, issue of the Washington Daily News, written by R. H. Shackford, which reads:

President Johnson has thrown down a challenge to the Congressional critics of his policies in Vietnam.

He dares them, in effect, to try to repeal the resolution the House and Senate passed last August after the Tonkin Gulf shooting incident.

That resolution gave congressional blessing in advance to anything President Johnson might do in Vietnam.

And the President made it clear yesterday during a long, rambling "impromptu" press conference that he isn't about to let his former colleagues on Capitol Hill forget that they gave him a green light to do anything he decides is necessary in Vietnam.

Madam President, my understanding may be faulty—and if it is, I hope the Senator from Idaho and other Senators who are on the floor will correct me—but it seems to me that at the time we gave our support to that resolution last August, the colloquies that developed on the floor of the Senate among various Senators and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who was handling the resolution for the administration, made it quite clear that we did not contemplate any radical change in our role in the war. The character of our role at that time was an advisory one, as the Senator from Idaho said today. We were there in a training and advisory capacity, and we made it clear time after time that the war had to be won by the South Vietnamese themselves. Neither the administration spokesmen nor Members of the Senate contemplated a major combat role for American troops in Vietnam.

Let us consider, for example, this colloquy, which developed with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. He said:

I had the opportunity to see warfare not so very far from this area, and it was very mean. I would look with great dismay on a situation involving the landing of large land armies on the continent of Asia. So my question is whether there is anything in the resolution which would authorize or recommend or approve the landing of large American armies in Vietnam or in China.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee replied as follows:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing in the resolution, as I read it, that contemplates it. I agree with the Senator that that is the last thing we would want to do. However, the language of the resolution would not prevent it. It would authorize whatever the Commander in Chief feels is necessary. It does not restrain the Executive from doing it. Whether or not that should ever be done is a matter of wisdom under the circumstances that exist at the particular time it is contemplated. Speaking for my own committee, everyone I have heard has said that the last thing we want to do is to become involved in a land war in Asia; that our power is sea and air, and that this is what we hope will deter the Chinese Communists and the North Vietnamese from spreading the war. That is what is contemplated. The resolution does not prohibit that, or any other kind of activity.

Then in additional colloquy participated in by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and myself, the Senator from South Dakota, it was made quite clear that no fundamental change in the character of the war was contemplated. The resolution of last August was endorsed primarily because it was viewed as an endorsement of the President's carefully limited retaliation to the attack on our destroyers by North Vietnamese PT boats.

I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if he would care to comment on the contention that is being voiced now in some quarters that the Senate, having endorsed the resolution of August 1964, no longer has any reason to speak out on the issue of Vietnam.

Mr. CHURCH. Whatever interpretation is placed upon the resolution to which the Senator from South Dakota has referred, certainly no one can contend that by it we pledged ourselves to silence in the future. Much has happened since that resolution was passed. The character of the war is changing, regardless of what may be said about it officially.

When does the war become a land war between the United States and Asian forces on the Asian mainland? When our land troop level reaches 100,000? When it reaches 150,000? When we have a quarter of a million troops there?

We know the facts. We continue to increase the number of American troops in South Vietnam, and we continue to broaden the terms of their engagement with the enemy. If we are to be honest, we must at least observe that a broadening of our participation in the war is taking place.

I believe that we must go even further. Unless we are nothing but a mock parliament, we must honor our constitu-

June 24, 1965

tional responsibility to advise and consent on this country's foreign policy, which is placed in the bosom of the Senate.

I have tried to make it clear that, though I have been for some time a critic of the general trend of American policy in Asia, I have never criticized the President himself. I understand the difficult problem that confronts him. I have nothing but compassion for him. I know he is striving every hour of every day to find some honorable basis for a settlement in southeast Asia.

But I know also that there are pressures in this Government—pressures indeed upon the President himself—to expand the war in southeast Asia in ways that I would regard as highly imprudent and prejudicial to the best interests of the United States. If we in this Chamber are to remain silent, if none of us will stand up and say, "We think this advice, these pressures, if you will, are inimical to the best interests of this country," Who will speak? Who will speak?

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota had the courage months ago to speak and he has since spoken up consistently for his views.

The other day I read a column by a learned columnist, Mr. Eric Sevareid. He made the observation, in substance, that the Congress is subdued, as though the United States were involved in a full-scale war.

He observed, in so many words, that there is a wartime psychology which has taken over here.

Madam President, we are not yet in a full-scale war. There are still ways to be explored to find an honorable settlement. The President himself has made that the avowed goal of our policy. Therefore, I say it is incumbent upon every Senator to do what he can to explore possible ways and means, to make suggestions, and, above all, to raise his voice against pressures in this city that would expand the war into what I would regard as catastrophic dimensions. A land war in Asia against Asians, if history is my teacher, would be a war that would find no durable, or desirable resolution for this Government or for our people.

I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam President, the Senator referred to the column by Mr. Sevareid, in which the writer commented, on the absence of real, searching debate on the issue about which we are speaking. There has come to my attention an editorial by Mr. John S. Knight published in the Akron Beacon-Journal of April 4, in which, in a rather lengthy and thoughtful editorial, he makes the observation:

Time was when great debates on foreign policy enlivened the Senate and informed the Nation. But today the voices of opposition are muted.

He added:

We have today no Borahs, Tafts, or La Follettes to challenge the creed of conformity. No men of great moral courage who would risk defeat rather than surrender a shred of principle. The voices of dissent have been stilled, and the great issues lie smothered by a pall of mediocrity.

I am happy to say that that editorial, while it contains a great deal of truth, is not entirely true as long as we have the clarity of thought and the courage that has been manifested here today by the Senator from Idaho. I again associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much for his generosity.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. I join the Senator from South Dakota in commending the Senator from Idaho for making what I consider to be a very thoughtful speech on this great and significant issue. I do not believe that anyone has delivered a speech with which I would agree 100 percent—including my own speeches 2 days later. But the speech of the Senator from Idaho contained a great deal of wisdom, and a great deal of courage was required for the Senator from Idaho to deliver it.

I was interested in noting the comments by Senator McGOVERN on the Tonkin Bay resolution. I would hope that those who write and talk about what the Tonkin Bay resolution means would take the trouble to read the Record of August 6 and August 7 and consider the views of the spokesman for the Foreign Relations Committee and the spokesman of the administration who stood on the floor of the Senate and interpreted the resolution. His interpretation of that resolution and what it meant and what the intent was is different from what many writers and others are saying was the intent of that resolution.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], quoted from a statement by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on August 6. He said:

Speaking for my own committee, everyone I have heard has said that the last thing we want to do is to become involved in a land war in Asia.

On another occasion, in response to a question I raised on August 6th, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said:

I personally feel it would be very unwise under any circumstance to put a large land army on the Asian continent.

For purposes of interpreting the intent of the Tonkin Bay resolution, all we have is the colloquy on the floor of the Senate in which the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee appeared here to speak in behalf of the administration and in behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee.

So I recommend a reading of the record of those days so that at least we may have an understanding of what was intended by the administration at the time the Tonkin Bay resolution was before the Senate.

I was pleased to hear the observations of the Senator from Idaho about the role of the Senate and the House of Representatives on this question. At the time the request came to the floor of the Senate for \$700 million so that we would have funds to pursue our enterprise in

South Vietnam, I voted against the measure, not because I did not know the money would be needed sometime though it was not needed then—I voted against the resolution for precisely the reasons stated by the Senator from Idaho; the reason that we in the Senate do have a responsibility publicly to discuss and to carry on intelligent debate about the role of the United States in Vietnam and everywhere else in the world.

I stated at the time that all the money necessary would be provided to carry on our enterprise there; but I read about the request on my way to my office in the morning and learned that it was intended that the Senate should vote on it in the afternoon. It was the unnecessary speed with which we were acting without adequate discussion that I objected to. Precisely for that reason columnists are writing, and the people across the country are saying, that this institution is nothing but a rubberstamp.

I endorse the Senator's view that it is absolutely necessary in a free society to insist upon a continuous public discussion of these great international issues. I had always thought there was universal agreement on that point. However, Senator CHURCH and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] were present at a small meeting in which we were told by a distinguished representative of the State Department that these discussions on the Senate floor were misunderstood in Saigon. The implication was that for that reason we ought to be silent. He said he had just read the speech made by Senator CHURCH and the speech of Senator McGOVERN. He said these speeches were intelligent discussions of the issue before us in South Vietnam. But he said everyone does not read the speeches of Senators. People read reports in the newspapers. Those reports do not exactly reflect what Senators say. What is reported in the newspapers then goes into the rumor mill in Saigon. It becomes further distorted. His whole point was that it is a kind of dangerous thing for us to exercise our right of free speech—a right for which blood has been shed for over a thousand years. Should we give up our rights because the people in some dictatorial country do not understand what freedom is all about? This position is absolutely unacceptable to me. I think it is unacceptable to all thoughtful people who are concerned about freedom and what it means.

Mr. CHURCH. I could not possibly agree more. I do not for a moment contend that protests against American policy on campuses, at teach-ins, or student picketings that have occurred in some places, or even in addresses on the floor of the Senate, no matter how carefully they may be made, can be grasped at as straws in the wind by Hanoi or by Peking. But that is the price we pay for being free. That is the meaning of a thousand years of struggle for freedom. A free people must behave in this way, because—barring a general war—vigorous dissent will exist in this country to any given policy, in any given situation, at home or abroad.

It makes no sense to say, "You may discuss domestic matters, but dissent must end at the water's edge. Foreign matters are the ones most vital to the survival of our Nation and the health and safety of our people." That is why the Constitution vested in Congress the power to declare war, recognizing that this, above all other decisions, was the most fundamental that a government could make.

So we have to conduct foreign policy in full recognition that we are and shall remain a free people. I tried in my address to point out that I do not believe that dissent from some quarters within the United States is the reason why Hanoi persists in the war. There are much better reasons.

But this argument serves those who would quiet all dissents, who would have us act like some monolithic mass; who seem to believe that our efforts against totalitarianism in the world should be conducted as though we were ourselves bound in a totalitarian straitjacket.

The Senator is correct: We in the Senate have a duty to speak up. I have tried to execute that duty today by pointing out that I fully support the President's efforts, and that I am in full agreement with what he said in his Johns Hopkins address—namely, that he is prepared to enter into unconditional discussions looking toward a political settlement in southeast Asia.

The new proposals I have made may not work; but no one yet has shown me how this country would be weakened by trying them. Until someone does, I shall continue to stress them.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution to the debate.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I should like to join the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Wisconsin in their commendation of the splendid address just made by the Senator from Idaho. I find myself generally in agreement with what he has said; specifically, I am impressed by the constructive suggestions he has made in the course of his remarks. However, I should like to express a slightly different view, to this extent:

We in the Senate should stop acting defensively about our constitutional duty to debate foreign policy in the Senate. Of course we must debate the Vietnam situation. Of course we must debate the Dominican Republic situation. Of course we must stand in support of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] in the brilliant address he made yesterday, in which he said, "Let us stop all the nonsense about the proliferation of nuclear weapons and try to reach an accommodation which will lift the burden of nuclear terror off the shoulders of the world."

I intend to pay no attention to the columnists hawks and the military for whom they front. Let the Messrs. Alsop, Hanson Baldwin, and William S. White, and the militarists for whom they front, take their particular positions with re-

spect to muzzling the Senate and cutting off debate in the name of phony patriotism. I say let us stop talking about our right to debate. Of course we are going to debate, and we need not be defensive about it.

I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho a few questions of substance in connection with his splendid address. First, does he not find himself in substantial agreement with the recent speech by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in this regard?

Mr. CHURCH. I do.

Mr. CLARK. Next, I wonder whether we do not have to take a somewhat more pessimistic view of the situation in South Vietnam than is represented by the administration's position at the moment or by the attitude taken by our good friend, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DOBBS], on the floor of the Senate not too long ago. I should like to make an observation and ask the Senator from Idaho to comment on it.

I am gravely concerned about what has happened in Saigon. I consider the installation, as premier, of Air Force General Ky to be a move of desperation. I am terribly upset about his announcement, as reported in the New York Times, that he has set up sandbags for public executions in the city square without trial, of individual citizens of South Vietnam who may or may not be profiteers, and the like.

I wonder what the Senator's view is concerning the sincerity with which we can support a kind of government which appears to deny every principle of freedom and democracy for which we are fighting. We have said we are in Vietnam to protect freedom, but I am afraid history will show that it is a freedom which, for more than 1,000 years, the people never had.

I wonder what the Senator from Idaho thinks about the contention that we are holding up the aims of a free people who, for some reason, seem to have chosen a government that makes Tony Imbert's government in the Dominican Republic look like a democracy.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I am afraid that we Americans have a tendency to wrap any American engagement abroad in a thick ideological cloak. Ever since we entered the First World War, we have converted our fights into moral crusades. Even now we talk about the free world, and our duty to stand as its sentinel on its every boundary, against communistic transgression. Heaven knows that I find communism repugnant. Everything that I believe in is contrary to Communist doctrine and Communist objectives. However, in all candor, I admit that communism is not the only kind of tyranny in the world.

If we take a look at the countries surrounding the Communist world, we have to look very hard to find one that is a free land. From Japan to Israel, with the exception of India and Malaysia, most of the countries are tyrannies. Many of the tyrannies are so reprehensible to the people living within the countries that, in this era of rising popular expectations, there will come revo-

lutions against them. I hope that the Government of the United States will not become so single-purposed in its fixation with communism that it places this Nation in the position of defender or protector over every rotten tyranny in what we euphemistically choose to call the free world. If we do that, our policy will never work. This is an era of great ferment in the world. There will be other revolutions in many of these countries.

For us to take the position that we are to be a kind of global policeman with the duty of imposing a Pax Americana, and with a military obligation to intervene to put down every future effort to overthrow established governments would be a foolish and futile enterprise, compared with which I can think of no example in the long course of history. Rome governed the ancient world by conquering it, and thus imposed a Pax Romana based upon a universal order of Roman law and government. That is not possible in the modern world, and it is the furthest thing from the American purpose or desire.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I completely agree with the Senator from Idaho. I should like now, if I may, to turn his mind to another, and perhaps unduly pessimistic, point of view. There are those, including the eminent Columnist Walter Lippmann, who believe that the time might well be past when we can negotiate with Hanoi, or even Peiping or possibly even with the Vietcong, and that we have reached a point of no return in that regard.

I ask my friend the Senator from Idaho to comment as to what we could do if, after having "stood firm" during the monsoon season—and I agree that we should, because I see no alternative and am in complete accord with both the President and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in that regard—at a cost of perhaps thousands of American casualties, the monsoon season comes to an end and we still have a foothold in Vietnam and there is no negotiation. Then what should we do? Should we go on interminably in a war which shows little hope for this country? Should we join our Republican friends who say that if that happens they will take the case to the country against the administration?

I ask these questions not rhetorically because I am not sure that I have the answers. I believe that the Senate debate should be one in which we should think through the problems and attempt to see what will happen when we get by the monsoon season.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for making a very excellent point.

I am told that the French, during the last phases of their attempt to preserve French rule in Vietnam, used to reassure themselves that things would be different after the monsoon season.

I believe it is also true that the advice we were giving the French in Vietnam, in those days, is very similar to the advice that the French are now giving us, 10 years later.

I can only say that I have made some proposals which I believe are worthy of

serious study. If they were tried, they might work. If they do not work, we shall not be weakened in any way.

In the meantime, I concur with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that we must stick it out, because we have made a commitment. Whether it was a wise or an unwise commitment is not the point. Once a country like the United States pledges itself to assume an obligation, that obligation must be honored. At the same time, we must continue to try to find a basis for a satisfactory settlement in Vietnam. One of the ways to do it is by continuing the debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, very briefly, I commend my colleague the Senator from Idaho for his usual, thoughtful and very courageous exposition of a problem that I am sure bothers us all.

I find myself in concurrence with the speech that the Senator has delivered today. I congratulate him on his courage in coming to the floor and trying to open and expand the dialog on the situation in Vietnam.

It seems to me that the Senator from Idaho has said, in a little different way, something that was said on the floor yesterday when the problem of nuclear proliferation was being discussed, and that is that we in the United States, merely because we are the greatest and richest country in the world, must take the initiative in seeking a way out of this problem, rather than comporting ourselves as though we were fearful of our prestige, fearful of being thought to be compliant, fearful of taking the steps that a truly great nation should take.

I find that implicit in the three proposals the Senator has made, which are: first, that we seek to have the United Nations enter this matter; second, that we affirm our willingness to deal with representatives of the Vietcong as part of the negotiations; and, third, that we advocate genuine self-determination for the people of South Vietnam, as the basis for an agreement settling the war.

I believe that these are great and worthy programs, and that we should have continued debate on the floor of the Senate.

We should fulfill our position as partners in this form of government and in our general policy.

I commend the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I thank the Senator very much for his words.

One final word concerning the prestige argument. The continuing war in southeast Asia, in my judgment, is steadily eroding American prestige in the eyes of most of the ordinary people in the Afro-Asian world, because they see the war differently than we see it. That is why Red China is so interested in seeing the war prolonged. If we were able to find a basis for a settlement that we could live with, that would not represent either unilateral American withdrawal or a repudiation of our commitment to

Saigon, our prestige would begin to rise again.

Does anyone think that French prestige has suffered since France managed to recognize that the era for the white man's control over Africa and Asia has ended, that is to say, since France stopped trying to preserve French dominion in that part of the world?

I realize our purpose is not the same as the French was. We all know it. It does not do any good to keep pushing this open door. The point is not how we see our purpose, or what we know it to be. The question is, How do the Asians see the war which outwardly seems to so much resemble wars with which they have had familiarity—the colonialist wars against the French, the Dutch, the British, the legions of the Western World.

I do not, I might add, have great faith in wars. Wars in this century have done more harm to the Western World than good. Rather than furnishing solutions, each great war created still bigger problems.

Our purpose is to seek a settlement in southeast Asia. That is the basis of our hopes; and then American prestige will soar again in the eyes of the peoples of Africa and Asia.

Madam President, I promised to yield the floor, and I am happy to yield the floor, so that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I shall take only a few moments. I ask the distinguished Senator from Idaho to bear with me.

I have read his statement with great interest. I did not, unfortunately, because of committee meetings, find it possible to be present with other Members of the Senate during his delivery of the speech. I would like to put his speech in focus with respect to the resolution that I am about to introduce.

I consider the resolution a complement—and I use the word advisedly—to what the Senator from Idaho has laid before us. The dialog must go on, but a debate without an instrument of authority before us for action is a very different kind of dialog from that which occurs when there are committee hearings, committee consideration, debate, and a vote. That is what I am trying to bring about.

When Congress passed Senate Joint Resolution 189 of August 10, 1964, it gave the President originally a big mandate. As Commander in Chief, he did not need it, but in our Government it was wise to get the advice and consent of Congress for such an important action. That resolution gave the President a blank check to use our Armed Forces, but it gave him a blank check only in the frame of reference at that time: that we were in South Vietnam as advisers, that we would strike back if we were attacked, as in the Gulf of Tonkin, that we would protect our bases, and that we would use the kind of discretion which was necessary under the prevailing conditions.

Now less than a year later we see the likelihood of a land war on a long-term basis.

Of course, the answer of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is right. We understand we are waiting for a break in time and are trying to push all the levers we can in order to get that break, that does not mean we should not stay there. We are mired there, if that is what we want to call it.

I try, in this resolution to do three things. One, to have Congress join the President in laying down our objectives in South Vietnam—that we have no designs in North Vietnam, for example, and are willing to go back to the 1954 Geneva agreement, which has been referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], by other Senators, and by the majority leader, who is one of the most knowledgeable Senators in foreign affairs.

The second point is to have Congress join with what the President said at Johns Hopkins—That we are ready to negotiate, even, as some have said, if it means having some representatives of the Vietcong in North Vietnam costumes in a delegation.

The third point is to declare our readiness to use every medium the United Nations offers in trying to arrive at a solution.

It must be remembered that when the President was urged to say that he was willing to negotiate, he said he had said it 43 times, but when he said it the 44th time, at Johns Hopkins, the world heard it and said, "Now the United States is willing to conduct absolutely untrammelled discussions."

So it is in this case. The President says he has a mandate. It is reported that he carries it around in his pocket and will show it to demonstrate that he is acting in team with the Congress. But the words of that mandate no longer mean what was intended in the light of the situation at that time. A new joint resolution would lend the solidarity of the President, the Congress, and the people to our effort.

I have read what the Senator has said, just as he has read what I have said. I would be much comforted by his comments on this matter. I am trying to add a proper compliment to the dialogue which has taken place by a distinguished group in this Chamber.

Mr. CHURCH. I understand exactly what it is the Senator is attempting to do. In a way, he is furnishing an instrument to cope with the mounting frustrations in Congress over this situation.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. CHURCH. His proposal is worthy of the most serious consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, because we are all groping for some answer, and we want to look very carefully at the one the Senator from New York has taken the initiative to offer today.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful for the comments of the Senator from Idaho.

I yield now, without losing my right to the floor, to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator

from New York. I am in agreement with everything just said on the floor. Throughout the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho, I have been listening, and I compliment and congratulate him on his excellent appraisal of our predicament in South Vietnam. He has rendered a real and needful public service today. Some may argue with his conclusions, but after listening carefully to his speech, I find that his logic appears unassailable. Like him, I fully support the President in his determination to maintain our commitments to the South Vietnamese Government, such as it is, as there is not much of a government there at the present time.

I also agree with the Senator from Idaho that perhaps further steps may be taken toward bringing the North Vietnamese regime to the conference table ready to settle this terrible conflict on honorable terms.

The threefold proposal which he has set forth seems to me to be an excellent beginning toward that desired end. I am hopeful that they will be given serious consideration in the Senate.

At this time, I should like to add one more proposal to those made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho. Since the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor as our Ambassador to South Vietnam, the situation militarily and politically has gone from bad to worse.

I fully concur with the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that, despite the statement made by one of our colleagues who spent a week in Vietnam on one of those guided tours which Senators sometimes take, and who stated in May, and repeated in June, that we were winning the war in South Vietnam, the facts are exactly to the contrary. The events of history show that he is wrong, that the situation over there is very bad militarily for the cause of the South Vietnamese people and for us.

The blame, or some part of it, may or may not be partly that of Ambassador Taylor, but it is obvious that he has outlived his usefulness as our Ambassador to South Vietnam.

I again urge that the President replace him with an outstanding civilian. Our Founding Fathers provided that civilian authority must always be supreme over the military.

Recently, when Ambassador Taylor was in Washington, I asked him some questions at a joint meeting of the Committee on Armed Services and the Foreign Relations Committee, at which time he made a bad impression upon me. The senior Senator from New York has referred on several occasions to the great statement of the President of the United States at Johns Hopkins University, that the United States was ready to negotiate unconditionally. In answer to a question I asked Ambassador Taylor, he referred to the proposed negotiations as "conversations." It must take a military mind, in my judgment, to draw a distinction between negotiations and conversations.

Before Ambassador Taylor left the United States, he stated that he saw no probability of a change in the South

Vietnamese regime. He had not returned to South Vietnam before the militarists took over there and threw out the civilian regime. This demonstrated to me the instability of the Saigon government, but it also demonstrated the poor judgment of Ambassador Taylor or the poor information which he is receiving.

Madam President, in having someone in Vietnam to give a new look at the situation as our Ambassador there, it seems to me that the President would do very well indeed were he to recall Ambassador Taylor and assign either Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, or former U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York.

Either of these two men would have the confidence of the country. W. Averell Harriman, in particular, is an exceedingly skillful diplomat. I am certain that the senior Senator and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] who was in the Chamber a moment ago listening to this debate—would agree with me that a man who attains a high public office in the State of New York and deals with a great many groups and factions, grows to become a great man and a truly great American—as are the two New Yorkers I have named.

I again urge that the President replace Ambassador Taylor with an outstanding civilian who has the confidence of the American people and who can bring a fresh approach to our dealings with the South Vietnamese Government—or should I say governments, as it is not known from day to day who is running that unhappy country. A man such as Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, or former U.S. Senator Kenneth Keating would make an outstanding representative of our Nation in Saigon.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for 30 seconds?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, in connection with the colloquy engaged in this morning, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two perceptive and well-reasoned articles written by the well-known commentator Walter Lippmann. The first is entitled "The Sharpening Predicament in Vietnam," and the other is entitled "The Fierceness of Red China." Both of these articles were published in the Washington Post this week.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 22, 1965]

THE SHARPENING PREDICAMENT IN VIETNAM

(By Walter Lippmann)

In his press conference last Thursday, the President quoted some secret reports he had received from a foreigner who had made contact with a high official in Hanoi. The President meant to convince our people that he had tried and failed to "get them (the North Vietnamese) to talk to us."

The first secret report was on February 15, very shortly after our bombing offensive had begun. The second report was on June 7, when the bombing policy had been in operation for 4 months. The substance of both

reports was the same. Neither the threat of the bombing nor the results of the bombing had induced Hanoi to take an interest in negotiating peace with the United States.

There is no doubt that the President is correctly informed. Hanoi will not negotiate with Washington because it is convinced that Saigon has lost the war and that we cannot reverse the results. In Paris a few weeks ago I talked with a number of specialists in southeast Asia, both French and Vietnamese. I asked them what would happen if the President ordered the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong and invaded with a very large army.

It would only make more certain, they said, the ultimate domination of Vietnam by China. For the result of all our bombing in the north and of all our fighting in the south would be to wreck and ruin the whole of Vietnam to a point where the Vietnamese themselves would be quite unable to reconstruct their economy.

They would have to turn to China. For the United States would find no government which it could support, and amidst the devastation only an oriental dictatorship would be able to deal with the chaos and the misery.

I have learned over the years to have great respect for the judgment of these men with whom I talked. They have the advantage not only of the long French experience in Indochina but also of their contacts, through the large Vietnamese colony in Paris, with Hanoi, and even with the Vietcong.

They are prophesying now that while U.S. military power can destroy the political and economic structure of Vietnam, it cannot transform the defeated Saigonese into victors. The more the devastation, the more certainly will China be the ultimate winner.

Does this mean that the time has passed, owing to the irreparable losses in South Vietnam, when the President can hope to induce Hanoi to negotiate with him? If he means with him, I am afraid there is no doubt it means just that. It is no less true, I think, that he is now unable, even if he were willing, to negotiate with the Vietcong.

At this grim juncture, the President is threatened at home by a Republican maneuver which he cannot easily dismiss. Messrs Laird and Ford told him last week that if his objective is nothing better than a negotiated peace, he is committing many too many American troops. This is an exceedingly shrewd political maneuver. For, if the President continues his present policy, which is to commit an increasingly large ground army in order to produce a stalemate, he will be accused of wasting American lives for no real purpose. Messrs. Laird and Ford, on the other hand, will go to the country saying that if the President had only dared to bomb Hanoi and Haiphong, the United States would have had a victory without casualties on the ground. It would not be true because all experience goes to show that wars cannot be won by bombing alone. But it would be effective demagoguery.

The President is in a squeeze because his limited policy has failed and an unlimited policy would incur greater risks of great war than he has a right to take. The moment of truth is drawing near, a moment when he will have to ask himself whether, since he cannot negotiate with Hanoi, someone else can. In the months to come he will have to consider whether the only course still open to him is to encourage the Vietnamese—Hanoi, Saigon, Vietcong—to negotiate with each other.

If they could work out a deal among themselves, it would no doubt mean that our influence in Vietnam had sunk to a very low point, except as we recovered some of it in assisting the reconstruction of the country. But there may be some consolation in the fact that a Vietnamese solution made by the Vietnamese might lay the foundations of

June 24, 1965

an independent Vietnam, independent of the United States to be sure, and, in some measure, independent also of China.

[From the Washington Post, June 24, 1965]

THE FIERCENESS OF RED CHINA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The quarrel in the Communist camp has become evermore ferocious and from our point of view evermore interesting. We have to begin by making a guess as to why, as the military situation in Vietnam grows worse, the Sino-Soviet quarrel becomes fiercer. There must be something of very high importance at stake between Moscow and Peking.

My guess—there is no way of knowing—is that the intensification of the quarrel is due at bottom to Red China's fears that there is in the making a Soviet-American understanding for the containment of China. If this came about, China would be strategically surrounded. There would be the Soviet nuclear power along its northern frontier and there would be American nuclear power, allied in some measure with the Soviet Union, along the Chinese southern and southeastern frontiers.

China's fear that this might happen could explain a number of otherwise puzzling things. It could explain Peking's recent accusation that the Soviet Union is an American stooge conspiring to end the war and deprive Peking of a total victory. It could explain the fact, which has now been confirmed officially by the Soviet Union, that Peking has been opposing and obstructing Soviet military aid to North Vietnam. For if the Russians appeared as the principal military defender of Hanoi, they would acquire a principal influence on the settlement of the war.

Moreover, if my guess is correct, the Chinese Government believes that if the war can be made to go on to the bitter end, the result will be to expel the Soviet Union and the United States from its southern borderland. Without having to fight itself, Red China would then fall heir to the wreck and ruin of Vietnam, and the historically anti-Chinese people of Vietnam would be decimated and prostrated.

These are high stakes, and only high stakes can account for the fierceness of the Chinese campaign against the Russians. If the hypothesis is correct, the first practical conclusion we must draw from it is that we must not be overzealous. The Soviet Union is still a Communist society, and we must not embarrass it by treating it as if it had turned renegade. We should act on the principle that the Soviet Union is a mature Communist society, and because of that—since both of us are mature societies—we have a common vital interest in coexistence and world peace.

It is not for us to make ostentatious and dramatic overtures to Moscow. But we can move with deliberation to remove the minor irritations, as for example, over the payments to the U.N. Beyond this, we should let other governments make the running while we hold on in South Vietnam and ponder the crucial and unavoidable decision of whether to encourage negotiation among the Vietnamese.

The fierce intransigence of Red China is a fact. Potentially and theoretically it threatens everyone. The great question is whether Red China's militancy and expansionism will be moderated in the course of time or intensified during the few years that remain before Red China becomes a nuclear power. It is a gamble, of course. But I myself am betting that moderation will appear in the course of time and natural evolution and can be brought on by patience, firmness, and diplomatic skill. The alternative is preventive war.

Back in the late 1940's when the cold war had begun, when Stalin was at his worst,

I was invited to lunch in the Pentagon with a high official. The object of the lunch was to persuade me to write articles in favor of launching a preventive nuclear war against the Soviet Union. Stalin, I was reminded, was a villain who was moving step by step toward the conquest of the world. There was no stopping him by measures short of nuclear war, and as we had the air force and the nuclear bombs while Stalin did not yet have them, it was our duty to strike him before he struck us. Not to do so would be criminal negligence. If we flinched and waited, we would lose the future.

I did not write the articles, but the luncheon made a profound impression on me, particularly in the years which have followed during which the Soviet Union has emerged from Stalinism. We gambled correctly that Stalinism would pass, and we won that gamble. We shall have to take the same gamble with Red China.

JOINT RESOLUTION DESIGNED TO TRIGGER HEARINGS AND DEBATE ON VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, on several occasions in the past 2 months—ever since it began to appear likely that American troops in large numbers would be sent into ground combat in South Vietnam—I have urged the President to consult Congress by means of a joint resolution to approve and support such an important new phase of United States participation in the Vietnam struggle. Laying a new resolution before Congress to follow the August 10, 1964, resolution, passed after the Bay of Tonkin incident, would have been a most desirable and responsible action on the part of the administration. But it has not been done. I am, therefore, introducing today a joint resolution—which I send to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD—which raises the issues and will, if acted on, inspire the hearings and debate which the situation requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 93) to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia, and to supplement Public Law 88-408, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 93

Whereas the Congress by joint resolution approved August 10, 1964, declared that it "approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression" and further declared that "The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia" and "is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom"; and

Whereas the deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist

regime in North Vietnam is waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom has risen in intensity and constitutes a threat to international peace and security which is not being met by action of the United Nations or other international agencies; and

Whereas the people of South Vietnam and the peoples of southeast Asia continue to desire the assistance of the United States in protecting their freedom and their right to be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way; and

Whereas the United States has no territorial, military, or political ambitions in that area, and the President has expressed the determination of the people of the United States that the United States is prepared to engage in unconditional discussions and negotiations to bring about a condition of peace and security in southeast Asia; and

Whereas the intensification of the aggression against South Vietnam requires the United States so materially to increase the means for defense against such aggression, including the use of the Armed Forces, as to make advisable a further joint resolution of approval and support by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the decisions made by the President, as Commander in Chief, in implementing the joint resolution of August 10, 1964, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.

SEC. 2. The United States declares its determination, consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, as the President determines, for the purposes set forth in section 3, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

SEC. 3. The United States affirms that the objectives of the United States are to bring about the cessation of hostilities by cease-fire or other appropriate means and the restoration of peace, tranquility, and security, and the observance of international treaties and agreements in South Vietnam, and to assist South Vietnam in obtaining a full opportunity for self-determination, religious freedom, economic and social progress, the establishment and strengthening of free institutions, and the enjoyment of friendly relations with its neighbors.

The United States is ready, whenever and wherever there is any willingness by the other appropriate parties to do so, to undertake honorable negotiations to attain these objectives.

SEC. 4. The United States regards international action to assure conditions of peace, security, and freedom in southeast Asia to be most desirable and is ready to join with other appropriate parties in assuring the maintenance of international peace and applying within that area the principles and provisions of the United Nations Charter.

SEC. 5. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, in this connection, it is important to note that Congress contemplated a continuing role, in conjunction with the President, in the making of our Vietnam policy. The intent of Congress to main-

tain continued participation is most strongly evidenced by its explicit reservation of the right to terminate by concurrent resolution the joint resolution of August 10, 1964. Congress having thus reserved this right, the time has now come to exercise it, when we seem about to enter upon a new dimension of the struggle not contemplated last August.

Madam President, I have explained the major sections of the joint resolution in colloquy with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], showing that it does actually accommodate the new situation which I have described by setting forth, first, our readiness and willingness to enter into negotiations—in which the Vietcong or similar forces could conceivably play a role as part of the North Vietnamese delegation; second, the objectives of the United States, which are confined to the situation in South Vietnam and include acceptance of a settlement for neutralization of that area adopted in 1954 in Geneva; and third, the acceptability of the United Nations to the extent that it can feasibly act in this area in whatever role may be found best, especially with the hope of bringing about a cease-fire and the initiation of negotiations between the parties.

First, this new resolution is needed because the resolution of August 10, 1964, is out of date. It was passed under wholly different circumstances, at a time when we were not bombing North Vietnam as part of the defense against the Vietcong, when the South Vietnamese Government looked relatively stable under General Khanh, and when we were there at the request of such a government. The likelihood then of direct U.S. involvement in ground combat in a large-scale struggle on the Asian mainland was not anticipated; we were not then on the verge of committing ourselves to such a conflict.

Second, the resolution is needed to provide a clear opportunity for the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees to hold hearings in an attempt to bring out the relevant facts and clarify the issues, and an opportunity, too, for full debate on the floor of both Houses—not undirected, sporadic debate—such as we have had this morning and on other occasions—but debate focused on specific language, carrying the responsibility of positive action.

Finally, the resolution is needed because the decisions now being made by the President are crucial. Let us remember that great powers do not bluff. Once a great power commits itself to a course of action, it cannot fail to carry through without serious consequences both at home and abroad. The United States cannot become directly involved in ground combat in South Vietnam, reserving the right to change its mind later on. If things go badly, I have no doubt that we will send in more troops, and more, and still more, for there will be no turning back and we will be committed as completely as we were in Korea.

The real question is not whether we are willing to send another 21,000 troops to Vietnam to help the South Vietnamese during this summer's monsoon rains. It

is whether we are prepared to send some hundreds of thousands of our troops into combat, as we did in Korea, if necessary—for it may become necessary. It is whether we are ready to face the American casualties of a long, drawn-out land struggle—for we may have to. It is whether we are prepared to risk a confrontation with Communist China or the Soviet Union, for we may have to.

The President may have the legal authority to make these decisions, but as a matter of policy they should not be made by him alone, without congressional approval and support.

The President should not risk leading the Nation, step by step, into a major conflict from which there is no honorable retreat—not without a clear mandate from the people and a united and determined country solidly behind him. An out-of-date resolution—and that is what the resolution of August 1964 is—is not enough. Neither is a Gallup poll.

We are on the threshold of crucial decisions, with large segments of the people anxious and uncertain, restive and confused. The probing and informed debate which the resolution I have introduced is designed to stimulate would contribute immeasurably to a better understanding of the whole Vietnam conflict and the proper role we can play in that part of the world. For there are still a great many nagging and worrisome questions unanswered, and a great many fears to be laid at rest.

Some of the important questions which need to be answered, always consistent with security considerations—and I am confident that it can be done that way—are these:

First. What is the exact nature and extent of the new combat responsibilities our forces are assuming in Vietnam?

Second. What is the nature and area of the conflict as now contemplated?

Third. Is it clear that the people of South Vietnam still want us there? That is a very critically important question.

Fourth. At whose invitation are we now participating in the struggle there?

Fifth. What do the people of southeast Asia and other parts of Asia think about the escalation of our involvement in this conflict?

Sixth. How much help are we getting from our allies, especially our SEATO allies, and what is the likelihood of getting more help?

Seventh. What practical possibilities exist of regional or United Nations action with respect to Vietnam? We hear a great deal about the Secretary General going out there. What, indeed, can the U.N. do? Let us remember that when the Security Council voted to undertake the responsibility of the conflict against the North Koreans, the Russians, for the moment, were not on the Security Council, and therefore not able to cast a veto.

Eighth. How much help are the Communists getting and where is it coming from?

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator drawn any conclusion from the latest development in South Vietnam? I refer to the South Vietnamese breaking off relations with France and closing down all newspapers in the country except two, which we presume are completely controlled by the Government. I value his conclusions rather highly. Has he drawn any conclusion as to this latest development?

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, it means a tight control by a government which is ruling by emergency power. That is the meaning also of the new Prime Minister's statement that he will shoot people without trial and take similar measures. This recalls Korea under Syngman Rhee, when we found ourselves between an imminent dictatorship and the necessity of protecting what had been accomplished there in the way of freeing South Korea. This is one of the endemic problems of our presence in South Vietnam and what makes me ask the question: "Do the people of South Vietnam want us there?" If they do not want us there, do we still propose to stay?

I conclude by saying to the Senator that this becomes a major factor in whether we should continue. I am with my colleagues in the Senate who have spoken this morning, and with the President, in saying that we should carry on if we are at all able to do so. However, the question involves the South Vietnamese governmental framework in which we are being asked to carry on. We need to have clear information on this, we need to digest it, and we need to see whether we can bring any influence to bear to see that human rights and liberties are respected. It is not a question which I can answer categorically by saying, for example, that if we find it is a dictatorship we should get out. But it is a question to which we should get an answer, because the answer will influence our total judgment as to what we should do.

Mr. AIKEN. Is that not a condition which was written into the resolution of last August, which is now interpreted in various ways? Did we not in fact commit ourselves to help those countries in southeast Asia when our help was requested and wanted?

Mr. JAVITS. And also, may I point out, we said to protect their freedom.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. If there is no freedom, there is no freedom to protect.

Mr. AIKEN. Do not the latest acts in South Vietnam strongly indicate a trend toward a form of government which we are committed to oppose with all reasonable means?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. The trend should be arrested. It is much easier to do that in the open, on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House, than in the privacy of an executive department.

Madam President, these are not the only questions. There are many others of equal importance to be answered. Indeed, one of the most vital questions is this: What do we expect to gain from a decision to commit increasing numbers of U.S. troops to ground combat roles?

We seem to be girding ourselves for a long and bloody summer in the hope that,

June 24, 1965

14114

in Senator FULBRIGHT's words, "When the current Vietcong offensive has run its course without decisive result, the Communists will be disposed to take a different view of our standing proposal for unconditional negotiations." I would not be quite so sanguine as the Senator from Arkansas about the prospects of successfully forcing the Communists to the conference table by denying them their hoped-for military victories this summer.

And this summer stalemate—what will it cost in casualties to achieve it? I am not saying, "Do not do it"—for it may, in the last analysis, be the least painful of all the alternatives. But I do not foresee a rush to the conference table as a probable result. Let us not once again be blinded by unwarranted optimism about Vietnam.

If one remembers nothing else I say, I hope he will remember this. We hear so many stories that the troops will be back in 1 year, or that we are on top of the situation, only to see it all disintegrate within a week or a month. Let us then not be blinded by unwarranted optimism; the situation in Vietnam is very rough and very difficult.

With the sorry prospect of intensified hostilities around the corner, we simply must redouble our search for an honorable peace. We cannot just resign ourselves to battle out the summer and then try again. I am, therefore, pleased to see the administration welcoming fresh efforts by Prime Minister Wilson and looking to the forthcoming Afro-Asian Conference for some new initiative. And while we have correctly held to our position that we will not recognize the Vietcong at the conference table, the Secretary of State has gone far toward making even this one condition to peace talks palatable by agreeing not to question the composition of the opposing delegation. All these efforts on our part to achieve a peaceful solution are commendable—they are more than commendable: they are essential. I am sure the President is continuing our quest for peace in every way open to him. He will need great wisdom, as well as great creativity and imagination, if we are to avoid another Korea in Vietnam. I wholeheartedly support him—as I always have—in those efforts, and I have little doubt I will be supporting him as we debate and enact an appropriate resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from New York 1 minute under the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. The decisions that the administration must make in the weeks ahead are decisions which could vitally affect the entire Nation, and they should be discussed and debated by the Representatives of the entire Nation in Congress, with the stark facts laid out before us. Then whatever we decide to do will be done by a strong and determined people, united behind their President in one of the major decisions in our history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] as a cosponsor of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

COINAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2080) to provide for the coinage of the United States.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2080) to provide for the coinage of the United States.

UNPRECEDENTED LAWLESSNESS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes under the bill to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, we are experiencing a wave of unprecedented lawlessness in our country.

The crime menace to our society and security has become critical. It is a problem of grave concern to all of us. The ever-lengthening shadows of crime now becloud each day and like a pall hang heavily with ominous warnings that we can no longer ignore. Indeed, so serious is the threat of mounting crime that President Johnson used the solemn occasion of the state of the Union message to comment about it.

The gravity of this problem becomes apparent and is placed in proper perspective when we consider that by this time tomorrow—within the next 24 hours—in our United States of America 25 people will have been murdered; 56 women, or perhaps girls of tender age, will have been forcibly raped; 305 armed robberies will have been committed; 505 aggravated assaults will have been inflicted; 1,265 automobiles will have been stolen; 1,925 major thefts will have been committed, and more than 3,000 burglaries will have occurred. Mr. President, over 7,000 major crimes are committed in this country every day, day in and day out, Sundays included, for crime takes no holidays.

Obviously, Mr. President, no nation, no civilized society can long withstand or endure such major assaults upon its structure. The goals of the Great Society are being imperiled. For there can be no Great Society unless it is also a safe society. And a safe society cannot be built nor maintained in a climate of crime, corruption, and moral decay. I mean, Mr. President, a society where it is safe for our citizens to walk the streets day or night; a society where our children are safe both at play and en route to school; a society where our women are safe from the attacks of depraved rapists; in short, a society where all of us

may at all times be safe in our own homes.

All of us—every citizen—has a duty and a responsibility to see that our laws are enforced; a duty to support and assist our law enforcement officers in their efforts to protect society. Mr. President, the crime rate increase is more than distressing—it is alarming. From 1958 to 1964 the total major crimes in this country jumped from 1,645,200 to 2,604,400—an increase of 999,200 in that 7-year period. In 1964 there was an increase of 13 percent over 1963. By 1975 it is estimated that our population will reach 225 million. A projection of the crime rate increase at 10 percent annually—and not at the 13 percent rate of increase that occurred in 1964—indicates that 10 years hence our citizens will have more than 7 million major crimes inflicted upon them. That would be one major crime for each 32 people in the United States.

Projected at the same rate of 10 percent until 1985 it is indicated that more than 18 million major crimes will be committed in that year, and with an estimated population of 266 million, that will be one major crime for each 15 people.

To those who say it just cannot happen, I say look at the figures—not just those I have projected, but look at the past record. Since 1958 crime has increased six times as fast as our population. In 1964 the crime rate—crimes per 100,000 population—was 11 percent higher than in 1963; 75 percent higher than in 1954; and more than double the rate in 1940.

So, Mr. President, not only can it happen, it has happened and is happening today.

What price do these criminals, the hoodlums, the parasites, the lawless who prey on our citizens, exact from our economy? The cost is burdensome. In 1964, the Federal Bureau of Investigation estimated that crime cost the American people \$27 billion. This is equivalent to \$143 for every man, woman, and child—or \$574 for each family—in the United States. The misery and human suffering that crime produces, of course, cannot be measured in money.

Mr. President, I have confidence in our military might and in our ability to defend against external threats to our security, but I am concerned and apprehensive about the possibility of destruction from within—destruction by a ruthless empire of organized crime known by such names as the Mafia, the Cosa Nostra, the syndicate or the mob.

The Bureau of Narcotics has for over 25 years tried to warn the public of the danger of the Mafia in our country. In doing so the Bureau quite often found itself on the receiving end of vitriolic criticism and derision from so-called good citizens; i.e., good in the sense of those who likewise refuse to believe that communism poses any threat to our survival.

History records that many civilizations have been destroyed from within. Let us heed that warning, lest we succumb to the tyranny of a criminal anarchy.